

1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

627

at the saved-pay rate to convert voluntarily to the premium rate whether or not the "computed" saved pay was higher than the premium rate. The Navy felt that the purpose of section 208(b) was to protect the firefighter or to save him compensation under the section only so long as it was to his advantage. This intention seems implicit in the mere fact of enactment of the saved-pay provisions in section 208(b).

However, the Comptroller General subsequently ruled on September 28, 1959, that a firefighter could not convert to the premium rate if his computed saved pay was more than the premium rate even though his actual pay was below the premium rate. The Comptroller General further stated that he would not question "at this time" elections to convert to premium pay made prior to his decision provided no further elections were permitted and the Department of the Navy requested Congress to amend section 208(b) to authorize such elections.

H.R. 2235 will supply this needed remedy by authorizing voluntary elections by firefighters to convert from saved pay to premium pay regardless of which is higher and by sanctioning those elections heretofore made. In addition, it will hasten the conversion of all firefighter employees to the annual premium rate at the earliest possible time without reducing their pay, which was the original purpose of Public Law 763, 83d Congress.

Mr. Speaker, our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the House of Representatives have favorably considered similar bills during the 87th and 88th Congresses, but the Senate has yet to act on this legislation. I believe we are permitting a serious inequity to continue unnecessarily in the case of these firefighters, and I intend to do everything I can during the 89th Congress to assure that these employees are relieved of this inequity.

STABILITY FOR DOMESTIC COPPER MARKET

(Mr. OLSEN of Montana was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill for the purpose of providing more stability in the present world and domestic copper market. The bill proposes that the Office of Emergency Planning be given the opportunity to loan from the national stockpile 100,000 short tons of copper to the primary producers to cover a period no longer than 1 year. In the event of an emergency, these loans could be recalled within a 30- to 60-day period. The Director of the Office of Emergency Planning would be given the responsibility for setting the necessary rules and regulations.

Currently there is a shortage of copper in the domestic market. It is estimated that it would take from 6 months to 1 year for distributors to meet current demands.

Current price of copper is 30 to 34 cents a pound. On the other hand, substantial quantities of refined scrap copper

have been sold at prices as high as 65 cents per pound. If this situation is allowed to go unchecked, it will also affect other areas of our economy. Plastics and synthetics could be introduced into the market of current copper areas taking advantage of a temporary shortage of copper, and creating catastrophe in other economic areas.

Relief cannot be given administratively so it is hoped that the Congress will act on this legislation to avert further danger to the market. Favorable action on this proposal would stabilize the economy and allow the necessary time for the copper industry to make up the lag that now exists.

GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON, DANIEL J. EVANS

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, at noon today in Olympia, Wash., a young man aged 39 will be inaugurated as Governor of the great State of Washington. His name is Daniel J. Evans.

Governor Evans has spent most of his young life in public service, having served in two wars plus 8 years in the Washington State Legislature in 4 of which he served as Republican house leader.

In taking the reins of the executive branch of the State of Washington he is continuing his dedication to public service. As he takes over his duties and responsibilities I am sure my colleagues wish to join in sending a message of congratulations and best wishes to the new Governor of the State of Washington, Daniel J. Evans.

AMENDMENT OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide additional deductions and exemptions for the expenses of medical care of persons 65 years of age and over.

While there are many proposals under consideration dealing with medical care for the aged, I believe this measure is worthy of enactment regardless of the outcome of other measures that involve direct assistance. The bill I have introduced involves no direct assistance. Rather it liberalizes the Internal Revenue Code to permit medical costs which persons over 65 incur, whether paid for by themselves, or someone else, to be a legitimate deduction for income tax purposes.

Specifically it would accomplish these objectives:

First. It would permit the Internal Revenue Code to permit the taxpayer to deduct, in full the amounts paid for medical and hospital care of any person who has attained the age of 65, irrespective of whether that person receives the ma-

jority of his support from the taxpayer as presently required. There is no reasonable basis for restricting the taxpayer to a smaller deduction merely because the dependent is not a parent. The financial hardship to the taxpayer is the same regardless of the degree of family relationship, and a brother or sister or even a friend who undertakes to help someone in need should not be penalized for doing so.

Second. Another provision in my bill would permit a taxpayer who has not attained the age of 65 to deduct in full the cost of prepaid medical care insurance which is to be effective when he reaches this age. I believe such a provision would encourage the insurance industry to further develop this type of insurance coverage. Certainly people ought not to be penalized for providing on a voluntary basis, for medical expenses which may occur in their retirement years.

Third. My bill would provide for additional exemptions for catastrophic medical care expenditures. A taxpayer, aged 65, who pays medical care expenses which amount to 25 percent or more of his adjusted gross income would be given one additional exemption and a taxpayer who pays such expenses in an amount equal to 50 percent or more would be given two additional exemptions.

Fourth. A final feature of the bill would permit medical care deductions to be carried back for as many as 5 years, or if necessary carried forward for the same period, so that the taxpayer over 65 can receive full tax benefit for such expenses by charging them against years when income was earned, and on which taxes were or are to be paid. This carryback and carryover principle already is part of the system by which corporations are subject to income tax, and it should be made available to our senior citizens so they can take equal advantage.

One reason why we now have the problem of how to deal with medical costs of persons who have reached retirement age, is that our tax structure has penalized those who have tried to secure their own future as well as others who would like to lend assistance.

I would like to see us take this first step and remove some of the tax inequities which exist. On one hand the Federal Government penalizes, through the tax system, those who try to secure their future, while on the other hand it proposes to install a new tax program under social security to meet the problem it has helped to create.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS FACILITIES

(Mr. TEAGUE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inform the House that there will be issued a news release this afternoon announcing the closing of 11 VA hospitals, 4 domiciliaries, and 17 regional offices. I want also to inform the House that there are documents furnished by the Veterans' Administration in the Veterans' Affairs Committee room, 356, so any Member requesting informa-

tion on these closings may get that information in the committee room.

LAWS DEALING WITH IMMIGRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 52)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

A change is needed in our laws dealing with immigration. Four Presidents have called attention to serious defects in this legislation. Action is long overdue.

I am therefore submitting, at the outset of this Congress, a bill designed to correct the deficiencies. I urge that it be accorded priority consideration.

The principal reform called for is the elimination of the national origins quota system. That system is incompatible with our basic American tradition.

Over the years the ancestors of all of us—some 42 million human beings—have migrated to these shores. The fundamental, longtime American attitude has been to ask not where a person comes from but what are his personal qualities. On this basis men and women migrated from every quarter of the globe. By their hard work and their enormously varied talents they hewed a great nation out of a wilderness. By their dedication to liberty and equality, they created a society reflecting man's most cherished ideals.

Long ago the poet Walt Whitman spoke our pride: "These States are the amplest poem." We are not merely a nation but a "nation of nations."

Violation of this tradition by the national origins quota system does incalculable harm. The procedures imply that men and women from some countries are, just because of where they come from, more desirable citizens than others. We have no right to disparage the ancestors of millions of our fellow Americans in this way. Relationships with a number of countries, and hence the success of our foreign policy, is needlessly impeded by this proposition.

The quota system has other grave defects. Too often it arbitrarily denies us immigrants who have outstanding and sorely needed talents and skills. I do not believe this is either good government or good sense.

Thousands of our citizens are needlessly separated from their parents or other close relatives.

To replace the quota system, the proposed bill relies on a technique of preferential admissions based upon the advantage to our Nation of the skills of the immigrant, and the existence of a close family relationship between the immigrant and people who are already citizens or permanent residents of the United States. Within this system of preferences, and within the numerical and other limitations prescribed by law, the issuance of visas to prospective immigrants would be based on the order of their application.

First preference under the bill would be given to those with the kind of skills or attainments which make the admission especially advantageous to our society. Other preferences would favor close relatives of citizens and permanent residents, and thus serve to promote the reuniting of families—long a primary goal of American immigration policy. Parents of U.S. citizens could obtain admission without waiting for a quota number.

Transition to the new system would be gradual, over a 5-year period. Thus the possibility of abrupt changes in the pattern of immigration from any nation is eliminated. In addition, the bill would provide that as a general rule no country could be allocated more than 10 percent of the quota numbers available in any one year.

In order to insure that the new system would not impose undue hardship on any of our close allies by suddenly curtailing their emigration, the bill authorizes the President, after consultation with an Immigration Board established by the legislation, to utilize up to 30 percent of the quota numbers available in any year for the purpose of restoring cuts made by the new system in the quotas established by existing law.

Similar authority, permitting the reservation of up to 10 percent of the numbers available in any year, would enable us to meet the needs of refugees fleeing from catastrophe or oppression.

In addition, the bill would—

(1) Permit numbers not used by any country to be made available to countries where they are needed;

(2) Eliminate the discriminatory "Asia-Pacific Triangle" provisions of the existing law;

(3) Eliminate discrimination against newly independent countries of the Western Hemisphere by providing non-quota status for natives of Jamaica, Trinidad, and Tobago;

(4) Afford nonquota status to parents of citizens, and fourth preference to parents of resident aliens;

(5) Eliminate the requirement that skilled first preference immigrants needed in our economy must actually find an employer here before they can come to the United States;

(6) Afford a preference to workers with lesser skills who can fill specific needs in short supply;

(7) Eliminate technical restrictions that have hampered the effective use of the existing fair-share refugee law; and

(8) Authorize the Secretary of State to require reregistration of quota immigrant visa applicants and to regulate the time of payment of visa fees.

This bill would not alter in any way the many limitations in existing law which prevent an influx of undesirables and safeguard our people against excessive or unregulated immigration. Nothing in the legislation relieves any immigrant of the necessity of satisfying all of the security requirements we now have, or the requirements designed to exclude persons likely to become public charges. No immigrants admitted under this bill could contribute to unemployment in the United States.

The total number of immigrants would not be substantially changed. Under this bill, authorized quota immigration, which now amounts to 158,361 per year, would be increased by less than 7,000.

I urge the Congress to return the United States to an immigration policy which both serves the national interest and continues our traditional ideals. No move could more effectively reaffirm our fundamental belief that a man is to be judged—and judged exclusively—on his worth as a human being.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 13, 1965.

PROPOSED RESERVE REDUCTIONS HAVE NOT BEEN THOUGHT THROUGH

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include certain supporting material.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, this is my first public comment on the matter of cutbacks of the Reserve program. Frankly, I have not known enough about it to comment. I was not one of the very few entrusted with advance information by the Department of Defense, although I have some responsibilities in Congress in this field. The statements that I have seen from DOD are vague, and in fact, I am convinced that DOD does not know how its own directive is going to be put into effect. I think this is a computer product. The DOD owns nearly a billion dollars worth of computers and all sort of strange ideas are being developed from them. Some of these look good on paper but they may be impractical in application. As of yesterday, DOD could not tell me the details of the manner in which they expect to carry out the directive on the Reserves which was announced as an accomplished fact some weeks ago.

I am convinced this matter has not been thought through. The proposal for the Reserve cutback should not have been announced without full consultation with Congress and it should not be implemented until such time as Congress is furnished with detailed information on the proposal and is afforded an opportunity to make a thorough study and review and has acted on the matter.

I echo the words of Senator STENNIS, who holds a prominent place in the defense committees of the Senate, who said:

Any effort to change or alter the provisions of the Reserve program without concurrence of the Congress would constitute a departure from the intent and instruction of the legislative branch of Government by the Constitution and should be done only after full hearings and with the consent and concurrence of the Congress.

Certainly the action of the Defense Department preempted the constitutional rights of Congress and violates the spirit of amity between the administrative and legislative branches of Government by not seeking a cooperative solution to the problem with Congress.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 111

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 14, 1965

No. 9

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Friday, January 15, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, JANUARY 14, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., called attention to this verse of Scripture before leading in prayer: I John 3:1: *Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God.*

Most merciful and gracious God, incline our minds and hearts to recognize the need of Thy presence and guidance in all of the deliberations and decisions of this day.

May we always be sensitive and responsive to the promptings and persuasions of Thy Holy Spirit seeking to fortify us against those temptations which would undermine our character and cause us to break faith with our better self.

Show us how the leaders in the affairs of church and state may strengthen and enrich the moral and spiritual life of our Republic.

Inspire them to help the people of our beloved country to cultivate those virtues which are the secret of a nation's cohesive and conquering power.

To Thy name we shall ascribe the praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that

the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 86-1, appointed Mr. TALMADGE to be a member of the Joint Economic Committee, vice Mr. PELL, excused.

SELECTION OF MINORITY WHIP

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Republican conference and by direction of the Republican conference, it is my privilege to announce the selection of the minority whip for the 89th Congress, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

REVISION OF THE IMMIGRATION LAWS

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the administration's immigration bill. President Johnson's proposal, as did President Kennedy's which I also sponsored, represents a new departure and a giant step forward in the direction of a humane and sensible immigration policy.

Before World War I our Nation, as the land of freedom, was looked upon as a haven for the oppressed where all were welcome to develop their potential in a democratic society. And our Nation was enriched by those who came from foreign lands. However, after World War I, the word "foreigner" became an epithet as fear, anxiety, and xenophobia gripped our land. In this atmosphere, a highly restrictive immigration policy based on the 1920 census was born. The national origins quota system based on a judgment that people from one nation are better than people

from another is still with us today. As President Johnson said yesterday in his immigration message, "We have no right to disparage the ancestors of millions of our fellow Americans in this way." The President also pointed out with respect to the national origins quota system, "Relationships with a number of countries, and hence the success of our foreign policy, is needlessly impeded by this proposition."

The administration's immigration bill eliminates the invidious national origins quota system over a 5-year period. With the passage of this measure, the results of the 1920 census will no longer shape our immigration policy. The bill also deals with the backlog of applications accumulated over the years in a number of our consulates abroad by providing for the administration of those on the waiting list during the transitional period and by weeding out those who are not serious applicants. This measure will benefit our Nation by providing for the admission on a preferential basis of those whose skills would be advantageous to the economy.

The bill will also end discrimination against the newer nations in the Western Hemisphere whose citizens are now bound by minimum quotas, while citizens of other nations in the same geographic area are entitled to nonquota admission.

Mr. Speaker, I join with President Johnson in urging "the Congress to return the United States to an immigration policy which both serves the national interest and continues our traditional ideals. No move could more effectively reaffirm our fundamental belief that a man is to be judged—and judged exclusively—on his worth as a human being."

January 14

A FIRM STAND IN THE UNITED NATIONS

(Mr. ROUSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, article 19 of the Charter of the United Nations provides that a member nation 2 years in arrears in payment of its financial contributions shall lose its vote in the General Assembly. One-fifth of the members of the United Nations are in default of their peacekeeping assessments. The rule is clear and so is the penalty for failure to adhere. Today I have introduced a resolution calling for the United States to stand firm in its position that article 19 should be complied with by all member nations. I do not consider this a vindictive stand. I do consider it a stand in support of basic principle. If the integrity of the United Nations is to be preserved then that body must follow the course set out in its charter. This is not a minor issue. A deviation on this point establishes a precedent for ignoring other provisions of the charter and the end result would be the dissolution of the U.N. into a debating society. If those nations in default do not pay their share then the United States would be justified in not meeting its obligation which now represents almost one-third of the total U.N. budget. If this should happen the result would be a total break down of the United Nations and its noble purposes. The United Nations must maintain its constitutional integrity if it is to be effective in dealing with world problems.

A MANY-SPLENDORED THING

(Mr. MONAGAN was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in his state of the Union message on January 4, President Johnson set forth a prescription for the Nation to follow in order to guarantee its future welfare and being. It is in general form, of course, as these broad statements must be, but it does represent his careful appraisal of the problems which face the nation with his recommendations for action.

All of the President's recommendations will not be realized by him. Some may never come to fruition, but he has furnished us with a broad blueprint that will be helpful to us as we begin our work in the 89th Congress.

I note that he gave the first third of his speech to a discussion of the international problems in which he expressed our willingness to move toward better relations with the European communities while maintaining our firm resistance to the spread of communism in Asia.

From the domestic point of view I was pleased with the emphasis which the President placed on the fight against water pollution as well as recommendations for an excise tax cut. I was pleased to note his emphasis on the need for improved public transportation and his use of the Boston-Washington route as an example for a possible improvement.

His recommendations for legislation dealing with presidential disability and providing for a National Foundation of the Arts were pleasing to me since I have filed and sponsored legislation in both fields.

The general reaction to the President's message has been favorable. One of the most cogent comments I have seen was published in the January 5 edition of the Ansonia, Conn., Evening Sentinel, with which I conclude my remarks at this point:

A MANY-SPLENDORED THING

President Johnson unveiled his plan for the Great Society. It is a many-splendored thing.

In the sense of long-term goals, it is an architect's sketch of cornucopia, a comprehensive enumeration of the needs and wants and hopes of people everywhere.

But the message was a far more specific document than the usual state of the Union message. It requires careful analysis over a period of time.

The President unveiled a vast package of domestic programs most of which must await evaluation when they are finally spelled out in detailed legislative proposals.

He proposes:

A big new program of Federal aid to education.

A Federal plan of hospitalization for the aged financed by social security.

A substantial cut in excise taxes.

A budget designed to move the economy forward with no hint whether it will pass his \$100 billion limit.

Federal participation in birth prevention to control population.

Reforms in the electoral college to bind electors to conform with the expressed will of the electorate.

A massive attack on disease through regional medical centers.

Enforcement of the Civil Rights Act, especially of the right to vote.

Repeal of the Taft-Hartley provision permitting States to pass right-to-work laws.

A doubling of the war on poverty.

An expanded open spaces program.

Increased Federal power to prevent pollution of streams and air.

A possible new department of housing and urban development to attack the problems of cities.

A regional approach to planning to meet the problems of Megalopolis.

Congressional readiness to make swift income tax cuts if there should be signs of a recession.

These are just the highlights among the domestic proposals. There are many others.

On the world scene, he invited Soviet leaders to visit the United States to address the American people on television and hoped American leaders might be privileged to address the Soviet people on Soviet television—an exchange whose relative propaganda values sound dubious and whose elaboration will be interesting to evaluate.

He pledged to continue U.S. aid to South Vietnam but made scant reference to the particulars of a serious situation.

The new Senate Democratic leader, RUSSELL LONG, observed that some of the suggestions are new and should be explored by the proper legislative committees. This should be a careful, down-to-earth process.

The new House Republican leader, GERALD FORD, said the ultimate goals set forth in the message are the goals of all Americans and have been the goals of America since its beginning but there are honest questions of implementation. Indeed there are.

So enormous a program demands the most careful inquiry as to how much, as well as how good. It must be studied in relation

to its full impact on the whole Nation's economy, as well as the usual pros and cons of the individual proposals.

PROPOSING RECORD VOTE ON ALL APPROPRIATIONS BILLS

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation changing the rules of the House to require a record vote on all appropriations bills.

At present there is no requirement in the Congress that votes be recorded on bills appropriating money for Federal spending. If each Congressman's vote on every spending bill before the House were made a matter of public record I believe such bills would be considered more closely and unnecessary spending would be reduced.

During the 88th Congress 35 percent of the votes cast on appropriations bills passing the House were unrecorded. These bills involved funds totaling over \$22 billion. The taxpayers are certainly entitled to know how their elected officials voted on such sums.

In addition, requiring the roll to be called when votes are taken on appropriations bills would also improve attendance during House consideration of such measures.

The record shows that an average of 13 percent of the House membership was absent when votes were taken on appropriations bills in the 88th Congress. There is room for improvement in view of the seriousness of the appropriations process.

THE U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to deplore in the strongest terms possible the activities of the U.S. Information Agency in making a "phony propaganda movie" of our red hot war in Vietnam.

As smoke bombs broke in brilliant colors and Vietnamese troops supposedly captured an enemy village, a U.S. captain said that "if they want to portray the war, they should try to do it at least like it really is." I share his views.

The USIA was founded to tell the truth about America to the entire world. Now the Agency has been exposed as conducting the same sort of misleading operation with its Vietnamese war film that the entire administration has been conducting with the American people on the overall situation in southeast Asia. This is deceitful.

To me, it is unfortunate enough that we must ask the American people to spend close to \$2 million a day to finance a war that we are apparently losing. But it is even worse to ask our citizens for another \$100,000 in tax money to finance a phony, simulated film in an effort to fool the world about the truth in Vietnam with a peek through rose-colored glasses.

not at some future date which will allow time for deployment.

Some comfort has been taken in certain circles from the belief that Nike X is not really important because missile defense can never catch up with missile offense. The just-completed Nike X threat analysis study sheds some interesting light on this theory. The study indicates that missile offense and defense are much closer to a standoff than many people believe.

The significance of this is considerable. For one thing, it means that a U.S. ballistic missile defense can play an important role in our strategic posture. More important, it means that the door is open for the Soviet Union to undertake an antimissile defense which can offset our present superiority in strategic missiles.

The administration belief that the Russians have not done so is indicated by the confident cutback by Secretary McNamara of 200 previously planned Minuteman missiles. But the questions remain of whether the Soviets could do so, and whether they could do so without our detecting the initiation of such a large-scale program.

An article in the December issue of *Fortune* by the very able Mr. Charles J. V. Murphy sheds some interesting light on this. Mr. Murphy details the history of the Soviet missile effort, as watched by the Turkish radars and the U-2 aircraft, as well as other intelligence sources.

Although we have detailed much of the history in this magazine as it developed, it is worthwhile noting what Mr. Murphy has to say about Soviet antimissile defenses: "Meanwhile, there had emerged, too, ominous indications that the Russians had begun to test an anti-missile-missile system, a concept that our scientists then held and still hold to be wholly impracticable. Indeed, the R. & D. center of this enterprise was finally located by a U-2 early in 1960 in Central Siberia, at Sary Shagan, a large community on Lake Balkash, about 400 miles east of the ICBM test establishment at Tyura Tam. It was established that the interception of rockets by other rockets had actually been attempted, with some success, and thereafter in U.S. intelligence calculations account had to be taken of the chance, however, improbable, that Soviet technicians might be close to a defense against the ICBM's."

As Mr. Murphy points out, this was in 1960. Dr. Harold Brown, chief of research and engineering in the U.S. defense establishment, acknowledged not long after taking office that the Soviets had a significant lead over the United States in this field. There is no reason to suppose the Russian effort has slackened.

The question remains: Could the Soviets conceal plans for deployment of an effective anti-ICBM system? With the Russians aware that they are being closely scrutinized by the Samos reconnaissance satellites, we find nothing surprising in the theory that a closed society such as the Soviet Union could hide its antimissile intentions until the last possible moment.

We then would be presented with a fait accompli which would offset our vast investment in Minuteman, Polaris, and Titan II.

Since it also is possible for the Soviets to carry out the same tactic in regard to new offensive missiles, we believe it necessary to move forward swiftly with both Nike X and a shelter program, no matter how unsettling it may sound.

A top defense official has something to say about that also. He points out that any anti-missile-missile system will kill a percentage of incoming warheads, but not all of them.

"Therefore, the destabilizing argument is just not valid," he says. Missile defense does not upset the mutual deterrence of the two sides.

We then would be presented with a fait accompli which would offset our vast investment in Minuteman, Polaris, and Titan II.

WILLIAM J. COUGHLIN.

HOME RULE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in the January 18 issue of *U.S. News & World Report*, there was published a thoughtful article on what would be involved in home rule for the District of Columbia. Students of American history are well aware of the fact that the first Congress of the United States met in Philadelphia, because that was where sessions of the Continental Congress had been held and where our Declaration of Independence had been proclaimed. The seat of the new nation was moved from Philadelphia to New York because the police of the city of Philadelphia failed to protect the new Congress from pressure groups. New York was not a desirable site for a national capital, because it was too far removed from the Southern States; so the Congress, meeting in New York, passed a bill to establish the capital midway between the New England States and the Southern States, to be located on the Potomac River, in an area to be designated as the District of Columbia, and it was not to have the privilege of suffrage and home rule. Over my protest, the Senate has voted on several occasions to give home rule to the District of Columbia. In my opinion, this would do violence to the fundamental principle underlying its creation by Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the *Record* the article on this subject, from *U.S. News & World Report*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

IF NATION'S CAPITAL DOES RULE ITSELF

A unique experiment is being proposed for Washington, D.C. The experiment: "home rule"—self-government for the residents of the Nation's Capital. It has the backing of the White House.

Most of Washington's residents are Negroes, and the prospect is that they would elect a Negro government. This would make Washington the only major city in the world governed by Negroes.

For nearly a century, this Nation's Capital has been governed by Congress, acting as Washington's city council, and the U.S. President, acting as the city's mayor.

Now political pressure is growing to give Washington, D.C., "home rule"—return the governing power to the people who live in the city and let them elect their own officials.

President Johnson has pledged the power of his administration behind a home-rule bill in the new Congress, in which the President has a heavy Democratic majority.

Chances of passage of such a measure are considered the best ever.

QUESTIONS AND PROBLEMS

Raised are these questions: What if the residents of Washington are given the power to rule themselves? Will a self-governing capital involve a unique experiment? What problems will it face?

In a nation whose population is 9-to-1 white, Washington is 58 percent Negro—the most heavily Negro of any big American city.

It is taken for granted that Negro voters, outnumbering whites, would elect Negro officials.

"It is my expectation that we will have a Negro for mayor," says Joseph Rauh, chairman of Washington's Democratic Central Committee and a leading advocate of home rule.

Whites also would be expected to give way to Negroes in other key posts—in the school system, police, and courts.

This would make Washington the only major city in the world governed by Negroes. And the United States would be the only predominantly white nation with a Negro as head of its capital.

Any new government in Washington would find itself beset by complex and growing problems, some of them unique.

Crime, increasing at a rapid rate, makes Washington's streets among the most dangerous in the Nation.

There is a strong and continuing migration of white families from Washington to nearby suburbs in Maryland and Virginia. Washington is becoming to a large extent a city of aging white couples with few children and Negro families with many children.

Washington schools—From 39 to 88 percent Negroes in 24 years

Year	White pupils	Negro pupils	Percent white	Percent negro
1940-----	56,547	36,263	60.9	39.1
1950-----	46,736	47,980	49.3	50.7
1960-----	24,982	97,897	20.3	79.7
1964-----	17,673	125,016	12.4	87.6

Source: District of Columbia Board of Education.

Among those moving out of the city are many big taxpayers.

Government is Washington's biggest industry. The Federal Government owns 43 percent of the city's land area. Foreign governments, with their embassies and chanceries, also own sizable chunks of valuable real estate. So do religious, educational, and charitable organizations.

Altogether 16,642 acres of Washington's land area are exempt from taxes. This is 54 percent of the city's total.

This raises tax problems such as are faced by no other city. Officials estimate that all these tax exemptions cost the city \$53 million a year in lost taxes. This loss is only partially made up by Federal contributions to the city, now running at a rate of \$37.5 million a year.

Many thousands of people who work in Washington don't live in the city. They commute from outlying suburbs—mostly by automobile. The Washington area has the Nation's greatest density of automobiles per square mile. It has no underground rail system. This means heavy spending for streets and bridges.

Other Washington problems include a big relief load, rates of illegitimate births, and venereal disease that are among the highest in the Nation, and public schools so heavily Negro that they defy attempts to achieve a "racial balance" in enrollments.

A CONSTRICTED CITY

Most cities, facing problems such as Washington's, can expand by annexing suburbs, thus enlarging their tax base and reclaiming some of the taxpayers lost by migration from the city.

Washington can't do this. Its boundaries—enclosing 69 square miles are fixed by Federal law. It is not a part of any State, so it cannot look to any State government for help.

Until the 1930's, when the Federal Government began to be big business, Washington was a relatively small city—only 486,869 in 1930.

Since then, Washington has grown to about 808,000 population, ranking ninth in size among all U.S. cities.

Yet Washington today has 146,900 fewer whites than it had in 1940—and 183,200 fewer

than in 1950. The city's growth is in Negro population.

Suburbs surrounding Washington are growing even faster than the city itself. And the suburbs are predominantly white—ranging from 1.8 percent to 11.7 percent Negro in 1960. Add in the suburbs, and only 25 percent of the 2.3 million residents of Washington's metropolitan area are Negroes.

WHY HOME RULE ENDED

The city of Washington had self-government from 1802 to 1874. But friction developed between the city and Congress.

Racial issues created additional friction after the Civil War. Some 30,000 freed slaves flocked into the city, and Congress and the local government bickered over who should pay for their education. When Congress gave the ex-slaves the vote, many white people boycotted the polls.

Washington population—From 28 to 58 percent Negroes in 24 years

Year	Total population	White residents	Negro residents	Percent white	Percent Negro
1940...	677,200	484,600	192,600	71.6	28.4
1950...	810,500	520,000	289,600	64.3	35.7
1960...	768,700	345,600	423,100	45.0	55.0
1964...	808,000	337,700	470,300	41.8	58.2

A sign of the future: Among Washington residents under 20 years of age, more than 70 percent are Negroes.

Source: 1940-50-60, U.S. Census Bureau and District of Columbia Health Department; 1964, Census Bureau estimate; racial breakdown for 1964 is a projection by economic unit of U.S. News & World Report.

The showdown came when the city overspent its income and Congress had to bail it out of debt. Then Congress abolished home rule and took over the city's administration itself.

Washington now has a Board of Commissioners who do some of the work normally done by a city council and mayor. All three members of the Board are appointed by the U.S. President.

Washington's local laws are enacted by Congress, which also controls the city's taxing and spending. Special committees are set up in each House of Congress to handle Washington legislation.

In recent years, home-rule bills have passed the Senate five times. Each time, the bill was blocked in the District Committee of the House, which contains several southern Members and is headed by Representative JOHN L. McMILLAN, Democrat, of South Carolina, an opponent of home rule for Washington.

A NEGRO GOVERNMENT?

It is generally recognized that one of the major obstacles to congressional passage of home rule is the large number of Negroes in Washington and the expectation that they would give the Nation's Capital a Negro government.

Many white Washingtonians share congressional reluctance on this account.

It is also argued that home rule would conflict with the concept of Washington as a Federal city, and that it might imperil the financial aid that Washington now gets from Congress.

Nearly one-fourth of all District adults hold Federal Government jobs that bar them, under the Hatch Act, from partisan politics.

A large segment of Washington's population is transient. Many residents do not really regard it as home. Those who have lived there long are not accustomed to voting. It was not until last year that Washingtonians were even permitted to vote for U.S. President.

Both the Democratic and Republican national platforms have endorsed home rule for Washington, however, and President Johnson recently wrote the Democratic city organization:

"I believe in home rule, and I pledge you here and now the best efforts of the next administration to provide local self-government for the District of Columbia."

All this is focusing new attention on Washington and its many problems.

THE CRIME PICTURE

While all big cities have reported a rise in the rate of crime in recent years, Washington's crime rate has increased faster than the average—83 percent in the last 7 years.

Police records show that of all persons arrested for major crimes last year, 87 percent were Negroes.

Much of the crime, in Washington as elsewhere, is committed by youths.

Largely as a result of the migration of white families to suburbs, more than 70 percent of all Washington residents under 20 years of age are Negroes.

This situation is reflected in the city's public schools, where 87.6 percent of all pupils are Negroes.

Washington's schools were segregated by race until the U.S. Supreme Court outlawed segregation in 1954. Then the school enrollment was only 57 percent Negro, and most of the city's schools soon became racially mixed.

Since integration, the flight of white families with school-age children from Washington to suburbs has speeded up—and many schools have, in effect, become re-segregated. There are now 26 schools that are all-Negro and 63 other schools with fewer than 10 white pupils.

Busing pupils from one part of the city to another—a method of "race balancing" tried in some northern cities—would have little effect in Washington.

A HAVEN FOR NEGROES

Washington for years has been regarded as a haven by the Negroes fleeing segregation and poverty in the South. There is no discrimination in restaurants and theaters. Housing barriers are falling slowly but steadily as the Negro population spreads into more sections of the city.

Government payrolls offer jobs for Negroes. Of the 27,133 full-time employees of the District of Columbia government, 50.3 percent are Negroes. Of the 247,000 Federal employees in the Washington area, 24.2 percent are Negroes.

Now, with the prospect of home rule, Negroes in Washington stand to gain a new opportunity. The Nation's Capital could become the first major city in the modern world governed by Negroes.

WASHINGTON'S BIG PROBLEMS

Crime: Up 83 percent in last 7 years. Among cities of 500,000 to 1 million population, Washington now ranks, per capita: First in aggravated assaults, second in robberies, fifth in major crimes of all kinds.

Last year, 87 percent of all persons arrested for major crimes were Negroes.

Relief: Welfare costs exceed \$11 million a year. Nearly 10,000 Washingtonians are on relief. Yet the unemployment rate in the Washington area is only 2.1 percent—which is far below the national average of 5 percent.

Tax exemption: City loses \$53 million yearly in taxes. Of Washington's land area, 54 percent is tax exempt. Most of this exempt area is owned by Federal Government.

Part of Washington's tax loss is made up by Federal contributions, which totaled \$37.5 million in fiscal year 1964.

Illegitimacy: District of Columbia rate highest of any city. Washington registered 4,529 illegitimate babies in 1963—a rate of 228.2 per 1,000 live births.

Of the 4,529 illegitimate babies, 4,145 were Negro.

Venereal disease: Widespread in Washington. Nation's capital has Nation's highest rate of gonorrhea—1,298 per 100,000 population. In syphilis, Washington ranks fourth

among all big cities, with a rate of 235.3 cases per 100,000.

Washington, D.C., No. 1 Negro city in the Nation—Percentage of Negroes in total population

	Percent
Washington.....	58.2
Charleston, S.C.....	50.8
Augusta, Ga.....	45.0
Richmond, Va.....	41.8
Jacksonville, Fla.....	41.1
Birmingham, Ala.....	39.6
Baltimore, Md.....	39.2
Atlanta, Ga.....	38.3
New Orleans, La.....	37.2
Winston-Salem, N.C.....	37.1
Memphis, Tenn.....	37.0
Jackson, Miss.....	35.7
Montgomery, Ala.....	35.1
Newark, N.J.....	34.1
Detroit, Mich.....	28.9
St. Louis, Mo.....	28.6
Cleveland, Ohio.....	28.6
Philadelphia, Pa.....	26.4
Chicago, Ill.....	22.9
New York, N.Y.....	14.0

Source: All percentages from 1960 census, except that Washington's is a 1964 computation by the Economic Unit of U.S.N. & W.R. from a Census Bureau estimate of the total population; Baltimore's is a 1964 estimate by the Baltimore Health Department.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I am opposed to changing our immigration laws as recommended this week by the President. His proposals are substantially the same as those of President Kennedy in 1963, and include some steps that have been advocated for 20 years.

While there will be disagreement on the exact number of immigrants to be expected, there certainly will be some increase, and every immigrant will be competing with an American citizen for a job at a time when unemployment remains a major economic problem. And I do not see how anyone can categorically say the number of immigrants would be increased by less than 7,000, if no quota whatever is to be placed upon the Negroes to be admitted from Jamaica, Trinidad, and Tobago. Thousands from those former British possessions already have flooded England, creating a serious economic problem.

Neither can I agree that our present immigration laws are incompatible with our basic American tradition. Our American tradition is that the first settlers were of Nordic stock, and came from Great Britain. Shortly after the Revolutionary War, there was a substantial immigration, from Germany, of those seeking religious and economic freedom. With the division of the Northwest Territory into States, the area was settled by a fine group of farmers from the Scandinavian countries.

Ever since 1882, we have had laws prohibiting immigration to this country of Orientals. Those laws have been only slightly modified in recent years. That was the basic American tradition, until broken in the early part of the current century by some ruthless industrial magnates, who brought thousands of workers from southern Europe into the coal fields and steel mills of Pennsylvania and West Virginia, to break the back of

a young and weak organized labor movement.

The Immigration Act of 1924 was passed for the deliberate purpose of protecting organized labor and of preserving the basic national characteristics of our Nation.

Following World War II, the United States, out of sympathy for stricken peoples, departed from its basic immigration policy, by passing, between 1948 and 1953, temporary laws under which thousands of displaced persons and refugees were admitted to the United States.

But in 1952, Congress reaffirmed its basic immigration policy, by passing the McCarran Act, which preserved the quota system and strengthened the safeguards against admission of Communists and other enemies of our democratic institutions.

President Kennedy said, and the claim is now repeated, that emphasis would be placed upon admitting immigrants who possess skill. That term is as vague as the word "discrimination" in the civil rights bill, and can mean anything that any bureaucrat sees fit to make it mean. But the door is left wide open to those without skill if they can claim relationship to someone already here. Most of the new immigrants will be of that character.

In other words, the removal of the limitation of national origins quotas is somewhat akin to removal of the gold backing for our currency. It is not a perfect system; but it furnishes an automatic brake, free from administrative manipulation.

If it be politically expedient at the present time to remove the handicap of the Immigration Act of 1924, why will not it be equally expedient at a later period to eliminate all restrictions, and to accept a flood of immigrants?

History has no example to equal the generosity shown by our Nation since the end of World War II to all of the so-called have-not nations of the world, and especially to the nations of southern Europe, who now are exerting pressure for the admission of more of their nationals.

We have loaned and given away about \$105 billion, and the end is not in sight. Included in our gifts have been millions of dollars' worth of food. But we should not lose sight of the fact that through erosion we have lost two-thirds of our fertile top soil, and our other natural resources are being used up, in the face of a birth rate greater than that of any country in Europe.

I hope this Congress does not complicate our problem of caring for our own unemployed by admitting more foreign workers at the same time that we are removing tariff restrictions upon what those who stay in Europe see fit to ship to us.

GRANGE VIEWS ON THE FARM CRISIS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a press release I have received today from the National Grange, in which

Herschel D. Newsom, distinguished master of the Grange, expresses that organization's views of the present farm crisis.

I find myself very much in agreement with what Mr. Newsom has said to the Florida State Grange.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GRANGE MASTER WARNS AGAINST REDUCTIONS IN FARM INCOME

TAMPA, FLA., January 7.—"The war on poverty cannot be won until the basic inequity between agricultural interests and the rest of our economy is eliminated. This cannot be accomplished by further reduction in agricultural prices, whether that reduction is the result of market forces or the withdrawal of Government money," Herschel D. Newsom, master of the National Grange, told the officers and delegates of the Florida State Grange, meeting in Tampa, Fla., for their annual banquet.

Pointing out that American farmers receive only about 75 percent of that which would be received by other segments of the economy for similar investments of labor, capital, risk, and management, the farm leader stated "The simple fact is that, whether we like it or not, the agricultural economy has been extended as far as it should be in terms of credit inputs. Rural banks have extended their lending capacity as far as is legally possible.

"Since 1951, American farm net income has dropped from \$16.3 to \$12.6 billion. During this same period, interest payments have increased from \$6.3 to \$27 billion, an increase of over 300 percent. Interest on farm debts has, in other words, increased from less than half net farm income to more than twice net farm income in this 12-year period.

"Farm debt last year increased about \$3.4 billion, of which \$2 billion was for nonreal estate loans. For the first time since 1961, farm real estate debt has risen considerably faster than nonreal estate debt," Mr. Newsom continued.

"With the present precarious situation being faced by American farmers, talk about continuing decreases in farm income, whether they are caused by decreasing expenditures or as a result of trade negotiations which permit our trading partners to erect unreasonable and discriminatory barriers against American agricultural exports is unrealistic and inconsistent with the economic and political facts of American life," the national master concluded.

WHEAT CERTIFICATE OPERATIONS WORKING SMOOTHLY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record two items from the current issue of the Southwestern Miller, dated January 5, 1965.

The first of these articles is about the smooth operation of the voluntary wheat certificate program, which became effective last July 1. The Southwestern Miller, a trade magazine, has praise for the manner in which the Department of Agriculture has administered the program, when it says:

Anyone who appraises the certificate program only from the standpoint of processor accounting can hardly avoid the conclusion that it is being quite well administered. ASCS is doing a far better job than the Internal Revenue people did on the processing tax of New Deal days.

The article reports that certificate payments on the 1964 crop will come to

almost exactly what we anticipated when the bill was enacted—\$450 million.

The second article is a report on the earnings of Pillsbury Mills for the 6 months ended November 30, 1964. The company's net profits after taxes set a record at \$5,464,000. This was an increase of \$720,000 over the earnings for the same period the year before. This indicates that the certificate plan has not had dire consequences in the milling industry.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CLOCKLIKE WHEAT CERTIFICATE REMITTANCES, ABOUT \$450 MILLION A YEAR, BRING COMPLIMENTS FOR MILLS

HANDLING THE CERTIFICATE MONEY

Nine miles or so south of downtown Kansas City is the Government office that, among other things, receives remittances from millers and other processors for wheat certificates. In the building in which this program is centered are 1,000 employees, 450 of whom are on the staff of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Only seven or eight of this group are assigned to certificate accounting with processors. Some others work on reconciliation of drafts drawn by county ASCS offices to cover payments to eligible growers. The major part of the building is used for other ASCS functions, most extensive of which relate to handling and marketing of wheat that comes into the possession of that agency.

Processors' payments for certificates required in November operations amounted to \$35,582,220.90, bringing receipts from this source up to more than \$164 million since the certificate program began on July 1. Anyone wishing to project the wheat certificate total for a year should begin his calculations with September, because dollar receipts for July and August were affected by extensive use of transition certificates. Total for the September-November quarter is more than \$113,500,000, which seems to point to an annual take of about \$454 million—probably somewhat less, as flour production usually is a little greater in the fall months than in some other part of the year.

MILLS SPEEDY AND ACCURATE

The certificate program has now largely become clockwork as far as processors' payments are concerned, according to Arnold E. Ferguson, assistant to the ASCS director and in charge of certificate sales. "It can hardly be called routine, as handling more than \$35 million per month is not a routine operation," he remarked recently. "Both we and the processors had plenty of humps to get over during the first 2 or 3 months, but these problems have been pretty largely resolved and a great majority of the reports are now arriving in complete order. There are still a few questions being raised, there are a few misunderstandings here and there, now and then we turn up errors on reports, but on the whole the processors are to be complimented upon the speed and accuracy with which they have conformed to the requirements of a new law."

INSPECTORS NOW ON THIRD ROUND

Mr. Ferguson added that a large majority of the difficulties now being encountered in the administration of certificate sales concern very small mills, mostly those that do a purely local business. Many of the people operating such mills did not have time, or did not take time, to acquaint themselves fully with the requirements of the law and the regulations. However, their problems are gradually being worked out. One of the factors that is helping considerably in this

connection is the work of six traveling inspectors who are currently on their third round of calling on all wheat processors. Incidentally, the checks thus far made disclose only a very few cases in which apparent excessive quantities of wheat have been ground under the producer exemption and these are presently being investigated.

WEIGHT AND CONVERSION FACTORS

Inquiry of millers and other processors about the mechanics of wheat certificates has failed to turn up many baffling problems. At first, of course, there were a number of questions that had to be clarified, but making the reports has now become systemized in almost all cases even if time-consuming. Probably one of the most important issues to arise has been the choice between using weight of wheat and a standard conversion factor in determining certificate liability; a good many millers, chiefly those below average size, realized belatedly that it would be simpler and probably somewhat advantageous to them to use the conversion factor rather than weight of wheat. ASCS has authorized more than 30 such concerns to change their method of reporting in this respect, although it was stated earlier that once a choice had been made it would remain in force. Nearly all the larger and more efficient mills report on weight of wheat ground.

A BETTER ADMINISTERING RECORD

Anyone who appraises the certificate program only from the standpoint of processor accounting can hardly avoid the conclusion that it is being quite well administered. ACSC is doing a far better job than the internal revenue people did on the processing tax of New Deal days. The latter was a nightmare in more than a few respects; the regional internal revenue offices had little information for months and no consequential checking of compliance was done for a couple of years.

SERIES OF BURDENS UPON BUSINESS

The certificate program has nonetheless produced a series of burdens upon businesses that process wheat for human consumption. There is the clerical and executive time required to develop the data for accurate reports. There was a considerable loss on wheat inventories that were inevitably on hand July 1; the transition certificates that were heralded as a relief to the squeeze became in reality a means of saddling processors with a sizable expense item. Flour mills were the targets of a hard propaganda campaign by Government officials against rising prices stemming from higher material costs that were created by the program, a campaign that is at least partially responsible for heavy losses in this milling year. And a host of importunities have come from flour buyers for flour millers to undertake legal means to contest the use of wheat certificates, even though the prospect of success for such action would seem to be remote.

Millers have derived only one plus to date from the certificate program. The reduction in wheat prices that it brought about has in turn lowered the value of wheat inventories, so that interest costs have diminished. It is distinctly doubtful, however, whether savings in this quarter will offset any great part of the added costs referred to just above.

SOME DISTILLERS AND HEALTH FOOD

The vast majority of the 517 companies processing wheat for human consumption and therefore subject to the certificate tax are flour millers. The others include breakfast cereal manufacturers, a few soy sauce makers, a couple of distillers and several dozen so-called health food stores. Most of the stores grind only small quantities, in some cases as little as 10 bushels per month, but they have the same proportionate liability as do the large processors.

The grind of the health food stores is so limited—as is also the certificate grind of flour mills doing mostly an exchange business—that it costs the Government much more to collect their certificate payments than it receives from them. This has led to proposals that very small operators be exempt from certificate purchases, but the problems that any such step would create for other processors might well prove to be staggering.

IN VERMONT AND LOUISIANA

Location of the certificate-tax payers is shown on the accompanying map. Dots in such unfamiliar places as Vermont, Massachusetts, and Louisiana—unfamiliar for wheat processors, at any rate—denote health food stores, as does a considerable share of the cluster in California.

GRAND TOTAL OF \$231 MILLION

Total receipts from the 25-cent wheat export certificates through December were \$67,138,537.64, including \$990,000 as offsets against the export subsidy. When export figures are added to the processor payments, the grand total receipts to date are above \$231 million.

TO KANSAS CITY FEDERAL RESERVE BANK

The funds received from wheat processors and wheat exporters for certificates are deposited in the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, in an account that is earmarked for payments to producers.

RECORD FIRST-HALF EARNINGS BY PILLSBURY—
NET IN 6 MONTHS ENDED NOVEMBER 30, 1964, RISES TO NEW MARK OF \$5,464,000, WITH GAINS FROM CONSUMER FOODS, FOREIGN BUSINESS, AGRICULTURE

MINNEAPOLIS, January 5.—Net earnings of the Pillsbury Co. in the first 6 months of its current fiscal year established a new alltime record.

For the 6 months ended November 30, 1964, Pillsbury reported net profits after taxes of \$5,464,000, equal to \$2.49 a share on the common stock. This compares with \$4,744,000, or \$2.16 a share, in the corresponding 1963 period.

Sales for the first 6 months of the 1964-65 fiscal year amounted to \$224,308,000, up \$1,746,000 from the corresponding period of the previous year. The gain was in face of the loss of about \$12,500,000 in sales caused by withdrawals from operations that were not profitable.

THREE AREAS CONTRIBUTE TO GAIN

In the 6-month report to stockholders, President Paul S. Gerot emphasizes the contribution of new convenience food product developments, expansion of the company's international business, and an improvement in the agricultural area. Earnings from the latter area were increased by an integrated broiler operation and the sale of unprofitable formula feed mills.

IN MILLING IN JAMAICA, TRINIDAD

The 6-month report also includes the formal announcement of new Pillsbury operations in Jamaica and Trinidad. In Trinidad, the company will assist in the operation of a flour mill now under construction and will participate in the marketing of the mill's flour output. In Jamaica, Pillsbury will help establish both a flour mill and a livestock feed plant, and be part of the mill's marketing organization.

CONSUMERS PRODUCTS NOW ABOVE 100

Nine new products in the consumer area went from research and development to retailers' shelves nationally in the first half of the year, it is stated. This brings the number of Pillsbury consumer products in total distribution to more than 100.

The report notes that a \$13 million capital expenditure program this fiscal year includes the equipping of a 174,000-square-foot con-

sumer products plant at Terre Haute, Ind., which is scheduled to open in the early spring.

Mr. Gerot pointed to a favorable second half for Pillsbury "based on sound business judgments of our marketing people, coupled with conservative national economic forecasts."

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S GREAT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, education and democracy are one and inseparable.

The foundation of a democratic society is a citizenry able to think for itself, and not merely willing but determined to do so.

In 1810 Thomas Jefferson wrote:

The information of the people at large can alone make them the safe, as they are the sole, depository of our political and religious freedom.

Thomas Jefferson said many times that education was the most effective weapon man had against tyranny.

He wrote in 1818:

If the children * * * are untaught, their ignorance and vices will, in future life cost us much dearer in their consequences, than it would have done, in their correction, by a good education.

We know he was right.

In his January 12, 1965, education message to the Congress President Lyndon B. Johnson documented the need to encourage every child to get as much education as he has the ability to take. The President traced the development of education opportunities in this country from the time of the Northwest Ordinance of the Continental Congress in 1787 which proclaimed that schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

Times change. What was adequate becomes obsolete. What was once progressive no longer is adequate to meet the challenges of the Great Society.

The President compared the cost of educating a child for 1 year as opposed to keeping a delinquent youth in a detention home or a family on relief or a criminal in a State prison for the same period of time. He told the Congress:

We now spend about \$450 a year per child in our public schools. But we spend \$1,800 a year to keep a delinquent youth in a detention home, \$2,500 a year for a family on relief, \$3,500 a year for a criminal in a State prison.

If we are to achieve the national goal of full educational opportunity the President seeks, we must, first, build the 400,000 classrooms to house 4 million new elementary and secondary pupils in the next 5 years; second, replace existing, old facilities; third, train 800,000 new teachers and give to those who serve education now the skills and techniques of the 20th century; fourth, make available in sufficient supply such tools as books, libraries, preschool facilities, modern language laboratories, scholarships, grants, and employment opportunities for students seeking higher education at the college or postcollege level.

These needs are national. They must be solved at the national level.

When I was Governor of the Territory of Alaska I stated in my January 1949 message to the Territorial Legislature:

COMMERCE

Highway damage in Oregon and California alone is estimated at \$135 million. It will require 8 to 12 months to accomplish effective highway system restoration. Full support is being extended to State and local authorities.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The availability of stockpiled medical supplies was very helpful in meeting emergency medical requirements. Thirteen prepositioned emergency hospitals were set up and used. The hospital at Yuba City, Calif., was completely evacuated and reestablished in an available emergency hospital. State, county, and local health officials have been most cooperative in meeting the health problems. All communities have been advised of the health hazards and no special health problems are anticipated. Medical supplies are available to meet further requirements as they develop.

DEFENSE (CORPS OF ENGINEERS)

The corps has established 47 field offices in the flood area and has 867 personnel engaged in disaster relief activities. They estimate it will be at least 6 weeks before accurate damage surveys can be completed. In-place flood control projects are reported to have prevented \$250 million damage in California and \$500 million in Oregon. The corps is proceeding under its own authority and the direction of OEF under Public Law 81-875 with floodfighting, debris removal and repair actions.

INTERIOR

There is an estimated \$5 million damage to six Indian reservations and extensive damage to other facilities under the jurisdiction of Interior, including fish hatcheries, the Bonneville Power Administration, stream measuring facilities, and the national park system.

LABOR

Key State employment security agencies in the disaster area have been operated on a 24-hour basis, serving as a clearinghouse for labor requests. The economic impact of the disaster is suggested by an increase of 5,600 unemployment compensation claims in Oregon for the first week of the disaster.

Unemployment compensation benefits are being paid to eligible recipients on an expedited basis; claim processors have been flown by helicopter to disaster communities with authority to make eligible payments on the spot. The Department is prepared to meet the demands of reconstruction when it begins.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Because of an inadequacy in its loan account SBA, with approval of the Bureau of the Budget, has initiated a "deferred participation program" in which the major banks of California and Oregon are participating. Loans to eligible applicants will be made by participating banks under an agreement for re-purchase of 90 percent of each loan by SBA when funds become available. The SBA portion of the loan will be at "not to exceed 3 percent." Full information on the "deferred participation program" is being communicated to eligible borrowers.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Arrangements have been made to expedite adaptation of the regular housing loan programs of HHFA to meet anticipated requirements. Heavy involvement of this Agency will not occur until rebuilding actually begins and urban renewal problems are considered.

RED CROSS

Red Cross surveys indicate that 20,156 families have suffered loss in the 4-State area. Over 12,000 (including some summer residences) have been damaged or destroyed. In excess of 300 natural disaster staff have

been assigned to the disaster area to assist local Red Cross chapter volunteers in relief work. A number of community feeding centers have been established to feed evacuated personnel. Red Cross relief expenditures are anticipated to exceed \$5 million.

OEF has established disaster field offices in Sacramento, Redding, and Eureka, Calif.; Salem, Oreg.; Olympia, Wash.; and Boise, Idaho, and will establish additional offices as demands develop.

Please be assured that our staff stands ready to be of any assistance possible to you in coordinating Federal efforts in minimizing losses brought about by this disaster.

Sincerely,

FRANKLIN B. DRYDEN,
Deputy Director.

AN INDEPENDENT FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM—PROPOSALS TO CHANGE IT

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the December 28 issue of U.S. News & World Report, in a report on the problems the President faces in financing Government programs, with inflation just below the surface at home, commented that the "British pound sterling is far from out of the woods abroad. The dollar could face real problems if anything serious should happen to the pound. The boom in the United States soon will be entering its fifth year. It is important to do nothing to disturb confidence of consumers or business investors."

Earlier in December, the Honorable A. Willis Robertson, Senator from the State of Virginia, commented in an address in New York:

There are many Senators and Representatives who are seriously concerned about the inflationary forces that are building up and who expect the Federal Reserve and the Treasury and the Congress to live up to their responsibilities in meeting these pressures.

I want to express wholehearted agreement with that statement, particularly in view of the recent announcement that once again in the coming session legislation will be introduced to modernize the Federal Reserve System.

For years the advocates of the proposal to modernize the Federal Reserve System have pressed for a policy of cheap money and low-interest rates regardless of the economic situation. They have claimed that the system is operating unlawfully, in conflict with policies of the President and the Congress; and have told the people that their Senators and Representatives have neglected their duties by allowing this to happen. It occurs to me that some of us who think sound money is important and that cheap money would be disastrous should speak up if only to show that we are no more asleep on the job than were Carter Glass and Robert Owen and our other predecessors who made the Federal System what it is today.

Money is easy now, and has been since the 1960 slump in business. Partly because credit has been amply available, at the lowest cost in the world, the American economy has recovered well from the 1960 recession. So far, this has been accomplished without the kind of inflation we have experienced too often in the past, even though, as Senator ROBERTSON has pointed out, the money sup-

ply is growing rapidly. Commercial bank loans are increasing at better than 10 percent a year. While their home mortgage loans grew at about the 10 percent rate from mid-1963 to mid-1964, their mortgage loans on nonresidential, non-farm properties jumped by more than 16 percent in the same period. These figures simply confirm what we can see in our own cities—that office buildings, hotels, and apartments are springing up wherever a spot can be found. I happen to agree with those who are worried about whether banks are helping to blow up a bubble that can burst in financing some of this construction, but whether that is true or not, it is clear that bank credit is doing all and probably more than it can to stimulate the economy.

The only way I can see to conclude that money is tight today is by comparison with what it would be under the World War II bond-pegging policies that we are occasionally urged to return to. We are told that the Federal Reserve could save the taxpayers \$5 billion a year in interest on the Federal debt, by restoring 1946 interest rates on Government obligations. In 1946, of course, the Federal Reserve System was following a policy of buying Government obligations in whatever amounts were needed to hold interest rates on Government bonds at 2½ percent—a policy that started as part of the war effort but continued into 1951. It resulted in a mammoth increase in the money supply, and contributed to an inflation that has cost the American people far more than \$5 billion a year in taxes alone, not counting what they pay in higher prices.

Congress was not asleep at the switch when this bond-pegging policy was abandoned in 1951 by mutual agreement of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve. The 1951 Treasury-Federal Reserve accord followed extensive congressional hearings and a report urging a return to a flexible monetary policy as a means of fighting both inflation and recession. That kind of monetary policy can best be achieved by maintaining the present degree of independence of the Federal Reserve System. What this independence means—and what it does not mean—is revealed in a recent statement by the Chairman of the Board of Governors:

Independence of the System, to me, means simply that our decisions regarding extension of Federal Reserve credit must be made in the light of their long-range impact on the value of the dollar and the soundness of the credit structure on which our market system depends, and not out of solicitude for the momentary financing needs of the Government. Independence does not mean that the Federal Reserve can establish goals in conflict with those of the President or the Congress. We should, and do, use our limited powers to produce a monetary climate in which the economy can flourish, adding its strength to the attainment of whatever goals Americans may seek. The Federal Reserve cannot overcome all the maladjustments that keep some Americans from sharing in the general prosperity any more than we can guarantee perpetual continuance of that prosperity. The Federal Reserve cannot make the policy decisions that determine ultimately whether this country's international transactions will come again into balance or its gold will flow abroad. What we can do,

and all we can do, is to make credit decisions as soundly as our ability permits, so that transactions in international markets may proceed with a minimum of interference from speculative forays against the dollar, and so that domestic markets, in performing their task of bringing together those who seek goods and services and those who can supply them, may have the benefit of a reasonably stable price level. If this kind of credit climate is to be maintained, the decisions on which it depends should be made by an institution devoted solely to that end and responsible for its achievement. This is my conception of what Congress did in setting up the Federal Reserve System. This independence of judgment strengthens the formulation of the Government's overall economic policy, and the achievement of our national economic goals, as well as strengthening the credit structure on which the Government must rely to accomplish its objectives.

I see no evidence to support charges that this independence has been used to obstruct programs established by the Congress and the President. On the contrary, President Johnson and President Kennedy both have endorsed the principle of independence and emphasized the harmonious relations that exist between the administration and the Federal Reserve.

In 1952, the Patman subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee issued a report commenting that:

The Federal Reserve System has been a helpful institutional development. Its roots are sunk deeply in the American economy and it has borne good fruit. This is more important than that each portion of it be subject to classification by species and genus according to the rules of a textbook on public administration.

During the 1964 hearings on the Federal Reserve System, Secretary of the Treasury Dillon testified that the necessity to test policy proposals against the views of an independent Federal Reserve is, I believe, the best insurance we can have that the claims of financial stability will never be neglected.

He added that the Federal Reserve is a living institution that has demonstrated its capacity to innovate and to change, and which has maintained an established tradition of independent judgment, a mixture of regional participation and policymaking, with the ultimate central control here in Washington, which is unique in our Government, and it has shown an ability to attract highly qualified officials and staff and has had the reputation for operating impartially and efficiently.

To change the present Federal Reserve System to facilitate the making of cheap money will be a mistake and not in the general long-range interest of our Nation.

MEETING OF INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION GROUP JANUARY 18

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in accordance with the bylaws, the annual meeting of the Interparliamentary Union group will be held on January 18 at 9:30 a.m. in room S-126, which is in the Capitol. It is the Appropriations Committee hearing room in the Senate wing of the Capitol.

The agenda of the meeting will include the following subjects:

First. Report of the retiring president, Mrs. Katharine St. George.

Second. Report of the Executive Secretary.

Third. Election of group officers for the 89th Congress.

Fourth. Nomination of Mrs. St. George as an honorary member.

Fifth. Plans for IPU conferences in 1965.

Mr. President, all Members of the Congress of the United States are members of the United States group of the Interparliamentary Union, and are entitled to attend the meeting and vote on subjects that come before the group. A large attendance at this meeting is hoped for.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON RETURNS OUR IMMIGRATION POLICY TO BASIC AMERICAN PRINCIPLES

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, President Johnson is making history this week. It is great history. On Tuesday he sent a splendid education program to the Congress. On Wednesday he sent an epochmaking immigration message to the Hill.

The President's legislation will abolish the existing quota system based on national origins. He rightly says:

That system is incompatible with our basic American tradition.

And he followed this radical and inspiring proposal of reform with the following equally inspiring elaboration:

Over the years the ancestors of all of us—some 42 million human beings—have migrated to our shores. The fundamental long-time American attitude has been to ask not where a person comes from but what are his personal qualities. On this basis men and women migrated from every quarter of the globe. By their hard work and their enormously varied talents they hewed a great nation out of a wilderness. By their dedication to liberty and equality, they created a society reflecting man's most cherished ideals.

The President's proposal is reactionary in the true meaning of that word, which means merely a return to a former policy or tradition. His proposal reincarnates what was long the fundamental American idea, ideal, and practice.

Violation of this tradition by the national origins quota system does incalculable harm—

The President wrote, pointing out that by it is implied that immigrants from some countries are less desirable than those from others.

The fact is that the pioneering quality which caused men and women to leave their ancestral lands in the Old World with their minds and hearts fixed in hope on this land of liberty and equality, coupled with the opportunities afforded by our freedom, created, as that perspicacious French observer, Alexis de Tocqueville, shrewdly concluded, a new race of people—the Americans.

As President Franklin Delano Roosevelt once remarked to the Daughters of the American Revolution, who needed that reminder:

Remember always that all of us, you and I especially, are descended from immigrants.

And the miracle of America is that in one generation a refugee from oppression, from poverty, from lack of opportunity for advancement and self-betterment, has achieved either for himself or for his offspring a soaring from these depths to pinnacles of happiness and achievement.

Such examples abound in our midst. In his moving preamble to his keynote address at the Democratic Convention last August, Senator JOHN PASTORE, son of immigrant parents from Italy, said:

This is not in my script, but, indeed, it is in my heart. I would be a strange person, indeed, if I did not acknowledge this marvelous and wondrous manifestation of good will.

This is something that could happen in America alone. I am a first generation native American of immigrant parents who came to this great land at the turn of the century. My State has already honored me with the two highest positions in the gift of our people to bestow upon any citizen; namely, the governorship of the State and now membership in the U.S. Senate for 14 years.

A close parallel may be found in the record of another of our colleagues, ED MUSKIE.

His father, too, was an immigrant—from Poland. His son, like JOHN PASTORE, a first-generation American-born, likewise was honored by his State—Maine—with election to the governorship and then to the Senate.

I was with ED MUSKIE on a visit to Russia for the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and on Public Works to study its hydro programs when he left our party to visit his father's native village in Poland.

It was located not many miles from the town—now in Poland but then in Germany, in East Prussia—where my father was born. He, like the millions of others, had a vision of what America meant. A teenager, he left Prussia for America, where he volunteered for enlistment in the Union Army and served in the 7th New Jersey Volunteer Infantry. Returning to New York after the Battle of Five Forks, in which he fought, and Appomattox, where he witnessed the surrender of General Lee, he studied medicine, specialized in ophthalmology and otology, receiving the highest honors in both fields, being elected in 1903 as president of the American Otolological Society and of the American Ophthalmological Society in 1910.

Many of our colleagues are first-generation native Americans. Like JOHN PASTORE and EDMUND MUSKIE, FRANK LAUSCHE and ABE RIBICOFF, whose parents were born in Yugoslavia and Poland, respectively, before coming to the Senate served, in the case of Senator LAUSCHE, as both a judge and Governor of Ohio, while Senator RIBICOFF served as a judge and Governor of Connecticut as well as in the Cabinet; both the parents of our wonderful majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD, were born in Ireland; so were Senator McNAMARA's; the parents of Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, previously Secretary of Agriculture, came to this country from Sweden; Senator JAVIER's mother was born in Palestine, his father in Austria; both of Senator FONG's par-

ents were born in China; our Vice-President-elect's mother, Mrs. Humphrey, came to these shores from Norway, as did the mother of Senator WARREN MAGNUSON; DAN INOUE's father was born in Japan.

These parents, born abroad, were admitted to the United States before the national origins quota legislation was enacted in the 1920's. Had it been in effect at that time, it is quite possible that the parents of some of these outstanding Americans might not have been admitted.

The President's bill will eliminate other discriminations in existing immigration law. It will rectify the hardships involved in the separation of families by existing quota restrictions. It will give, for the first time, favorable consideration to immigrants with special skills. It will extend more generous acceptance to victims of persecution, to exiles from tyranny in less happy lands.

If the Goddess of Liberty, whose statue has long been the symbol and beacon of hope in New York Harbor to the arriving immigrants, could speak, she would doubtless say: "Again, Mr. President, I can lift my lamp beside the golden door."

Perhaps it would be appropriate at this point to read into the Record Emma Lazarus' classic poem "The New Colossus," whose message has been revalidated by President Johnson:

Not like the brazen giant of Greek fame,
With conquering limbs astride from land to land;
Here at our sea-washed sunset gates shall stand
A mighty woman with a torch whose flame
Is the imprisoned lightning, and her name
Mother of Exiles. From her beacon-hand
Glowed worldwide welcome; her mild eyes
command
The air-bridged harbor that twin cities
frame.
"Keep, ancient lands, your storied pomp,"
cries she
With silent lips. "Give me your tired, your
poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe
free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest tossed, to
me.
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

MAJOR ISSUES FACING THE COUNTRY—ANALYSIS BY NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR EFFECTIVE CONGRESS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the National Committee for an Effective Congress has prepared an excellent analysis of some of the major issues which face the Congress, the Executive, and the Nation at large in the years ahead. In his state of the Union message, President Johnson demonstrated the kind of leadership which the National Committee for an Effective Congress calls for in its statement. I trust that every Congressman, and particularly those of the President's own party, will give generously of their assistance in helping to build a better America.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the committee's statement appear at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ANALYSIS BY NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR EFFECTIVE CONGRESS

THE CENTURY OF EXPLOSIONS

Our globe is in upheaval and even our private worlds are being altered beyond recognition under the impact of onrushing technological and social changes. Willy-nilly, and with bewildering speed, the entire human race is being swept into new ways of life as radically different from our present condition as modern society is from that of the Stone Age.

The world has been shaken by the explosion of the atom, but more profound are the upheavals being caused by five cultural explosions: of population, of technology, of urban life, of knowledge, and of human expectations.

Our species which 500 years ago did not even know the shape of its own planet now talks of populating the solar system. And the burgeoning of new capabilities has sparked a worldwide undisciplined demand for economic amenities and social opportunities undreamed of a generation ago.

Those who understand the rate of change and anticipate the problems it will bring are deeply worried. The dislocation of human perspectives is so universal and rapid that we are now crossing the historical equivalent of a sound barrier unaware, and we are entering a new mode of life unprepared.

It is a premonition of what is happening to us as individuals that causes many to recoil from reality and hide behind simple fantasies. No longer is there refuge in the "elaborate cake of custom" which mitigated the personal impact of past changes. "What seems to threaten the whole post-1914 world," says historian William McNeill, "is a general dissolution of local cakes of custom, leaving millions without precise convictions as to what they should do." The shaking of the standards and norms of even modern society has plunged the world into vast insecurity.

The impelling forces are beyond the power of any man or system of government to substantially retard or abate. What can be hoped for—and possibly all that should be attempted—is to channel these forces in such a way as to preserve the decencies of a free society and assure continued exercise of individual aspiration and creativity. Theoretically, at least, we have the means to implement any reasonable choice as to the direction our efforts should take. The problem is to make the choice of goals and determine what course will get us there.

This is the essence of politics. It will be the task of statesmanship to understand that we live on the brink of a vastly different future and to communicate that understanding so that governmental action can anticipate and guide the flow of events. It will not be easy to convince comfortable Americans that they must determine to do something about the blight, unrest, anxiety and despair which are the byproducts of these revolutionary forces. For on the surface of our national life a shimmering prosperity obscures problems with a dazzling and bewildering abundance enjoyed by those who won or inherited a place in today's society.

A FORWARD LOOK AT FOREIGN POLICY

The upheaval is worldwide, churning all areas and peoples impartially. It seems bound, within the next 100 or 200 years, to cover the entire globe with a relatively uniform, automated and computerized civilization.

Everywhere the transition is profound and painful: from the problems of urbanization and automation that occupy the advanced societies, to the difficulty of reconciling elec-

tricity and cannibalism in the most primitive. Where we in the West have only to move from the 20th century into the 21st, others have to reach it from the stone age and from various intermediate stages.

To meet these forces of change since 1945 the United States has made many accommodations in foreign policy. But it is hard to think of any instance since the Marshall plan where American policy successfully joined with the forces of history in achieving a major success. Our diplomacy and military efforts have been largely protective, relying in essence on the force of arms in a balance of terror. Our other aid, trade, cultural exchange and people-to-people efforts, like the Peace Corps, have won modest successes. But while the postwar situation required the highest priority for military preparedness, events now call for a variety of initiatives along far broader and more imaginative fronts which would exploit what is still America's most potent resource, the compelling force of a free society.

To this end American statesmanship will have to be directed toward three major international opportunities facing the Johnson administration immediately:

(1) A recovered Europe is capable of standing on its own feet and determined to make its own choice as to where it should go. If the Atlantic community is to survive in any meaningful sense, it must now be on the basis of consensus and newly defined common purpose.

(2) The Soviets are encountering grave problems in overcoming economic inefficiency and political instability. These problems are our opportunity—not merely for respite in the cold war but also for a rollback of communism where it is most dangerous: in the minds of its adherents. Now that the frailties and frauds of the Soviet system are evident even to the Communists themselves, we have a chance to find ways of persuading them to make adjustments that will bring their society more into line with our own.

(3) In aiding the backward areas, we must act even more in terms of cultural and political effect than in economic terms. This is a matter of understanding the basis of our own accomplishment—that habeas corpus and freedom of speech preceded the industrial revolution. We must be able to communicate to others the value of freedom with such examples as the success of the American Homestead Act in contrast to the failure of the centrally administered Soviet virgin lands program.

We have shown too little creative initiative in promoting the democratic thesis through diplomacy, trade and politics, and have relied too much on frozen military postures. The ties that constricted the old power blocs are now falling apart, and a greater flexibility characterizes the international scene.

THE EXPLOSIONS HIT HOME

At home the problems intertwine and interact, but all stem from the explosions of our century:

The technological explosion, with automated production techniques requiring fewer people at higher educational levels.

A knowledge explosion in which data accumulation is growing at twice the rate of the rest of the economy.

A population explosion in which the 190 million Americans today may become 300 million in less than 40 years.

The effects of these explosions, which become cases in themselves, include:

Urbanization, the growth of megalopolis, requiring the doubling of dwellings and work spaces by the year 2000—building in 35 years the equal of everything constructed in North America since the Pilgrims landed.

Atomization and uglification of individual lives under increasing tension, frustration, noise, congestion, and endemic disorder.

"Underclass" sedimentation, the accumulation of professional poor who live on doles in subsidized ghettos outside the culture, which become political enclaves manipulated by demagogues who perpetuate the boroughs of blight, color being used to reinforce economic barriers.

Youth without hope who drop out of schools that can provide no motivation, expanding the number of unemployable in an increasingly technological economy.

Contraction of free enterprise and opportunity caused by concentration, merger, monopoly, and conglomerate monopoly, galloping toward corporate statism, and fostered by mass control of tastes and standards.

Obsolete governmental apparatus with overlapping and duplication of Federal, State, and local functions unsuited for complex problems which often spill over their arbitrary boundaries and require improvisation of new administrative units such as interstate port and highway authorities.

There are not problems which can be solved by nostalgic New Deal thinking. Today, many of the liberal welfare concepts of the past irritate rather than cure. The difficulties of the affluent society do not derive from poverty, and they may require the ministrations of artists and psychologists as much as the ministrations of Dr. Walter Heller. Economics is only one factor among many, and the solutions which alleviated starvation may not be equally applicable to glut.

THE EMPTY "IN" BOX AND THE EMPTY LOBBY

These historic imperatives have not yet matured as political issues. They are not found on the agendas of the great lobbies and there is no public clamor for their solution. Business, labor, agriculture, and the Government bureaucracy itself, which constitute the major pressures on policy formation, are not consciously involved with the explosive issues of tomorrow. Each interest group conserves its Sunday punch to protect its own economic base, jealously defending a special power domain within a heavily featherbedded status quo. For the most part, their influence is defensive as they exert vetoes rather than venture initiatives.

Even the intellectual community is not yet exerting a coherent influence upon Government or the public for attention to these problems. The folklore of liberalism is still dominated by memories of the great depression and the concept of a mature economy whose principal problems were distributive.

Administering the future is going to be vastly different from disposing of the accumulated agenda items of the past. In the words of a White House aid, retorting to the suggestion that the landslide made things easier for the President: "From here on our work is going to be mostly self-generating. It is a lot more challenging when you have to be creative than when you are fielding problems as they hit you."

President Johnson's "in" box is virtually empty. The leftover housekeeping problems from the last years of Eisenhower and the unfinished domestic program of the Kennedy administration have been substantially dealt with in Johnson's first, spectacular year. (Medicare seems almost certain of generous enactment by the incoming Congress.)

Lyndon Johnson now stands before a vast horizon on which he, more than any other individual in the world, can determine where the road should go. Never before in history has it been possible for a society to option its future to such a degree. The physical environment, including the production of food, has largely been conquered. The location of new cities can be arbitrarily fixed. Our society is being governed more and more by fiat. Population and industry flow to the district whose Congressman wins the research and development project. The computer has replaced the town meeting. The

engineer, the economist, the other specialists will provide the data. How it will be used, the rate of change and the balance between human values and management efficiency, will be determined by the politician.

MR. JOHNSON'S BRAIN BANK

In approaching the complexities of the scientific age, Mr. Johnson has called upon school men and experts for suggestions and programs—bypassing Government departments cursed with routine thinking. The President must start anew because he does not have the backlog available to Franklin Roosevelt whose New Deal ideas and top command were assembled and rehearsed in Albany before he occupied the White House, or of John Kennedy who was presented with a 4-year accumulation of basic position papers for the New Frontier by the Democratic Advisory Council.

Since last June some 13 task forces have been preparing analytical studies and recommendations for the President. They were kept carefully out of sight, and premature disclosure of their findings avoided. These findings are now being conveyed to the President through the Bureau of the Budget.

The panel on education is one of the most impressive, and its thinking probably will rate very high when the legislative program is drawn at the White House. Its chairman is John W. Gardner, president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and its members include David Riesman, Jerrold Zacharias, Edwin Land, and Father Paul Clare Reimert. As with all panels, the executive secretary is a Budget official.

Robert Wood of MIT is chairman of the panel studying urban problems; Carl Kayser heads the one on foreign economic policy; Paul Samuelson on unemployment; and Richard Goodwin on beautification of the physical environment. There are panels on resources and other major subjects. The President is known to have urged all panels to submit their "best thinking" on the various problem areas, and to let him worry about political feasibility.

Whether their recommendations will be welded together in one comprehensive program for Congress is not yet known. "The work is uneven, some of it imaginative, and some of it flat," says a White House confidant. "Don't look for a Great Society blueprint, with every White House proposal being another brick or doorknob to fit a master plan."

While the depth and impact of these task forces should not be exaggerated, they indicate that the President is reaching for fresh ideas. This fact will tend to give his proposals a degree of special authority with Congressmen. But the age when philosophers advise the king is not yet at hand, for the program must first survive its trial by Congress. In making the transition from the obese society to the Great Society, the Congress will be the President's prime vehicle and prime obstacle.

II. THE PRESIDENT

Whether Lyndon Johnson gets a footnote or whole chapters in history will depend on his ability to work in the fields of the future. In the broadest sense the President will have to be our prophet—the seer through whose eyes we perceive and prepare for the worlds of tomorrow. (As Senate leader, Lyndon Johnson was known as "the master of the immediate." Today the pace is so swift that the immediate is what is at the other end of the telescope.)

Within the past decade Mr. Johnson has served his country at three different levels—as the legislator-arbitrator, as the President-inheritor, and now as the President-leader. He proved masterful at the first two levels. His talent for flexibility and parliamentary maneuver made him a successful broker between contending forces. The same man

must now raise an uncompromising standard and be the passionate champion for his own program.

There is much speculation in Washington as to how Johnson will carry this new role. He will be required to show a degree of creativity and inventiveness not demanded in his previous tasks. As a southern Congressman puts it: "He will have to probe deeply into what America means and where it ought to be 20 years from now. He will have to surround himself with mature and far-sighted aids. Mere political competence won't carry him through." He will have to risk his popularity, and rebuff many of the divergent groups who rallied under that "one big tent" on election day, if he is to move a comfortable society toward difficult goals.

Many in Congress may realize the existence of the real imperatives but only the President can get the kind of visceral understanding from the country which is necessary for legislative action.

Whether Johnson has the requirements of history in mind as he moves will be tested by many benchmarks, such as whether he:

Does not intervene to protect the two southern Democratic bolters to Goldwater from being purged from the Democratic caucus in the House.

Resists efforts to tamper with reapportionment.

Urges an education program geared to upgrading curriculum content and quality rather than mere construction of school buildings.

Invents new regional frameworks for adjusting to urbanization.

Attempts to cure problems like traffic congestion and slum proliferation rather than merely subsidizing the problems by pouring money into existing agencies for servicing them.

Encouraging elimination of featherbedding in industry and labor along the direction he has already taken with respect to the military.

Can Johnson the tactician and administrator, also become Johnson the teacher and missionary? He has not been noted as a great orator, but few have resisted his rare gift of persuasion. One of this President's friends who has worked with him closely for many years says: "Lyndon knows there's no public understanding of the really fundamental problems so he tries to push them himself. He wants to develop a kind of 'on-rushing consensus'; then he will run around ahead of it so that he can lead it or have it push him. He will start from scratch on an issue and end with 80 percent of the public behind him. Lyndon is a very sophisticated man."

On the other hand, another knowledgeable Democrat doubts that President Johnson will try anything really creative with Congress: "The one word Lyndon learned in 24 years on Capitol Hill is 'do-able.' You only try the 'do-able.'"

But when you are President of the United States what is "do-able" depends in a large measure on what you try.

III. CONGRESS

New combination to unlock the House

The new Congress is the most heavily Democratic since 1937-38. Although there has been no significant change in the Senate, the Democrats in the House now have roughly the same 2-to-1 margin enjoyed by their colleagues in the other body.

On the surface it would appear that the President should have an easier task with his legislative program in the next 2 years than any predecessor for the past 26. In fact, it may be expected that President Johnson's legislative record will be as stunning in 1965 and 1966 as it was in the year just completed. Lyndon Johnson knows his Congress very well and it would not be in char-

packaging bill. It implies that food manufacturers are taking advantage of consumers through deception in the sizes and weights of packages and the information printed on labels. Among other things, this bill with the politically appealing name would give the Government the right to dictate weights and other standards for food-product containers.

Mrs. Esther Peterson, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, has held four consumer conferences at which housewives were not only invited but urged to submit complaints about the products they buy in their chosen supermarkets or other retail stores.

A National Commission on Food Marketing has been launched amid speculation that it would result in an exposé of what some Members of Congress have called profiteering by middlemen at the expense of both farmer and consumer.

Ostensibly, these actions were taken to help the consumer. Actually, they could, if implemented, hurt him. At the very least, they represent an unwarranted and unnecessary intrusion by Government into the American marketplace.

Take Senator HART's bill, for example. It ignores completely the fact that price competition is by no means the only competition which benefits the consumer. By making all packages "look-alikes" on the shelf, restrictive legislation would stifle innovation and put a halt on an indispensable form of competition: the freedom to bring out packages which are easy to open, easy to close, easy to handle, easy to store. Each of these represents an added value passed on to the consumer. My own company, for example, wouldn't have introduced instant coffee in a carafe or table syrup in a reusable pitcher if consumers didn't prize these containers as added values.

Advocates of more Government controls insist that food shoppers are often misled by nonstandard package shapes and deceptive labels. This is just not true. Any manufacturer who tries to trick the housewife into buying his products by packaging or labeling it deceptively will soon go out of business. She may buy it once, but she'll never buy it again. And since marketing a food product involves heavy costs, no processor can remain solvent on one-time sales. He depends on repeat volume.

Another contention of those who advocate still more governmental control is that labels are "hard to understand" and that the consumer is "confused" by odd-ounce weights on packages. Their assumption, apparently, is that package sizes and weights are produced willy-nilly. Again, my own company offers an example of the absurdity of that kind of thinking. We pack vanilla pudding and chocolate pudding in the same size box. As rightfully required by law, the label on every package shows the weight of the contents. The vanilla-pudding weight is 3¼ ounces, while the chocolate-pudding weight is 4 ounces. The reason is that this is the quantity of pudding mix which, in the case of each flavor (as stated on the label), will yield exactly four servings of one-half cup each when blended with two cups of milk.

Because of the difference in the density of the two flavors, to pack the vanilla in a 4-ounce size would necessitate giving America's housewives recipe directions with an odd measure of milk to be added—and more servings than she has planned on.

Is this what the consumer wants? Is this a Federal case—a matter calling for enactment of legislation by the Congress of the United States?

While Congress considers the demands for unnecessary new limiting controls, Mrs. Peterson has been holding public meetings and frequent press conferences inviting homemakers to register complaints.

I want to make it clear that I regard and respect Mrs. Peterson as a conscientious and dedicated public servant. But she is part of a political party and subject to pressures aimed at currying favor by offering the consumer "more protection," whether it is really needed or not.

The fact is that despite the best of motives, her consumer conferences—with their emphasis on complaints—have, in my opinion, resulted in more harm than good. For one thing, they have unnecessarily created doubts in the minds of consumers where none had existed, and indeed where none are warranted. For another, they represent just one more intrusion by Government into an area where, in our free society, Government does not belong.

But even more ludicrous than the politically slanted campaign to prod complaints from consumers is the image drawn of the typical American housewife. In their attempt to show why the housewife needs more Government protection, proponents of additional controls have created the impression that she is a timid, naive, confused little woman, hopelessly gullible, bewildered by the endless variety of products on the grocery shelves and exposed, as she shops, to the machinations of lurking profit-hungry figures who dominate the food business.

This, of course, is utter nonsense. I can testify from experience that when it comes to clever buying, the American housewife can give lessons to a Yankee horse trader. She knows exactly what she wants, and she knows precisely what it's worth to her. And if you don't provide her with what she wants at what she considers a fair price, you won't get her as a customer.

What politicians don't seem to understand is that no manufacturer can force a consumer to select his product, out of all those displayed, any more than a politician can force a voter to pull the lever by his name in a voting booth. Politicians need to be reminded also that we in the food business are up for election all the time.

Where a politician has to run for office once every 2, 4, or 6 years, every shopping day is election day for us. The homemaker casts her ballot—for or against—by taking our product off the shelf or leaving it there. She can make or break a product and can even vote a company right out of business. Every major food processor has in its files the stories of products that were developed at great expense only to languish on supermarket shelves because they failed to win a sufficient number of purchases by the only person qualified to control the American food industry: the American housewife. So my image of the American consumer is quite different from the one shared by the proponents of more and more Government regulations. The consumer is smart. She is alert. And she very effectively does everything that is necessary to keep the food processor in line.

All this is not to say that Government involvement in business is all, or per se, bad. The National Commission on Food Marketing, for example, could be a very good thing. The study the Commission will complete by next July 1 could help bring to Americans much-needed understanding of how our advanced society gets food from farm to table. It could, for example, clarify just who is really a farmer, by distinguishing between those rural dwellers who raise crops for a living and those whose main income is from industrial employment, even though they do farm some very small acreage as a sideline.

Most importantly, the Commission's study could clear up, once and for all, the question of just what a middleman is. For centuries, this word has carried a connotation of all take and no give. Since earliest civilization, a middleman has been pictured as one who buys cheap and sells dear, contrib-

uting nothing to the value of the goods in the process.

That probably was true, way back. But today, the villain the politicians are chasing is no villain at all. Far from it. In our urbanized, industrialized society, the middleman is the one who takes raw food from the farm and then makes it possible for people to eat it.

Milk in a pail at a farmer's gate is worth nothing to the 9 out of 10 Americans who live off the farm. As a weekend dairy farmer, I am only too painfully aware of that. Consumers can't possibly all drive out and get their daily quart. The only way milk takes on value is through its availability when and where the consumer can conveniently get it. In other words, consumers simply won't pay for wheat in the barn, peas on the vine or hamburger on the hoof.

The food marketing chain of events encompasses all the vast activity that goes on from farm gate to checkout counter. This has created and sustained the Nation's market for processed farm products. And this adds value after value—at a reasonable cost—every step of the way.

I said the cost is reasonable. It is, in fact, surprisingly low. For example, the U.S. Department of Agriculture reports that the homemaker gets frozen orange-juice concentrate for less money per glass than she pays for juice she squeezes from fresh oranges. Similarly, a cup of excellent instant coffee costs her less than one she brews herself. She also saves money, as well as work, by buying processed frozen or canned peas and corn, frozen lima beans and spinach, canned spaghetti and chicken chow mein, among a great many others listed as bargains by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Yet politicians prattle about consumers being forced to buy processed, packaged foods at premium prices.

Instead of hurting the farmer, the food-marketing complex actually helps him. It helps him just as it does the consumer. For at the same time that it makes it possible for people to eat, it creates sales for the farmer's crops.

We hear much about how small a share of each dollar spent for food goes to the farmer. Yet, the fact is this: If every single dollar of corporate profits made by the food marketing industry were eliminated—that is, all the profit of processors, wholesalers, food chains and independent food retailing corporations—the total marketing bill would be reduced only enough to add a single percentage point to the farmer's share of the retail food dollar.

So the farmer certainly is not victimized by the food marketing system. Neither is the homemaker. Yet the politicians say both are, and demand stricter controls.

Actually, my great concern in all this is not alone for the food industry, but for the free society of which the food industry is such a vital part. What disturbs me most is the destructive impact a heavier hand of Government is bound to have on the free choice we Americans now enjoy. For we are faced with the grim prospect of having Government officials tell the consumer what products she can buy and what kind of package she can buy them in. We see vote-conscious politicians informing the housewife that she doesn't really need all those things she's been purchasing; she has merely been gulled into wanting them.

The point really at issue—the point involving one of our cherished freedoms—is simply this: Who is to say what is a need and what is a want? Shall we, as individuals, continue to determine the answer, or shall we leave it to an allwise, paternalistic Government to decide?

I feel the danger is most acute in the area of food distribution. For in any standard of living, food is the No. 1 requirement. Be-

January 15

738

fore he can do anything else, man must satisfy his hunger and be nourished in the process.

As certain people in Government with political motives champion the case for more and more controls, there are others, fortunately, who speak out for freer enterprise. Representative CATHERINE MAY, Republican, of Washington, made this statement, lauding the American homemaker for her competence and discrimination:

"She—the homemaker—has done and is doing a wonderful job in needling, inspiring, and in regulating American business enterprise. And to reward her, I want to protect her. Not with more Government regulations and laws. I want to protect her freedom of choice. I want to protect her right to reward or punish the businessman. I want her to stay the boss of the marketplace. As long as she is, there's no danger to our free-enterprise system."

OUR DISCRIMINATORY IMMIGRATION LAW MUST GO

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, there are few areas in our laws which more urgently demand change than our unfair and discriminatory system of selecting immigrants to be allowed to enter our country. No provision of any national law is more distasteful to millions of Americans than the concept of judging the worth of men and women for immigration on the basis of place of birth or the ancestry of parents.

Five successive Presidents—Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, and President Johnson—have all asked for a revision in the present method of choosing immigrants on the basis of their nationality.

The only justification that can be made for the national origins quota system is that Americans with English or German or Irish names make better citizens than Americans of Italian, Greek, Polish, or Hungarian descent. This concept is utterly false. It contradicts all our traditions and ideals, and makes a mockery of the spirit expressed in the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal.

As a people, we are morally committed to seek a national policy which will make real the simple truth of the words of St. Paul:

God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the earth.

Under the present system, no matter how skilled or badly needed a man or woman is, if born in the allegedly wrong country, such person must wait years for admission, if lucky enough to be admitted at all, while others less qualified come almost at will. An Italian scientist or Greek craftsman or Polish engineer may bring more to our country than an unskilled worker from some northern European country. Nevertheless, under existing law the unskilled worker would come first.

While the annual quotas for Great Britain, Germany, and Ireland are seldom completely filled, there is a huge backlog of applications from people living in eastern and southern Europe. For instance, an American citizen with a Greek mother or father must wait at least 18 months to bring his parents to

this country. A citizen whose married son or daughter is Italian cannot obtain a quota number for 2 years or more.

President Johnson has again requested that Congress enact legislation to correct these deficiencies and to eliminate the national origin quota system. The distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] has today introduced legislation which will implement that request. This law would recognize that each immigrant has a special worth because of his potential contribution to the total manpower of our country and that he should be judged on his individual ability. Over a 5-year period, it would eliminate all quotas based on national origin. The total annual number of immigrants would be increased by less than 7,000.

People would be admitted on the basis of their skills, education, and training. Another governing factor would be the reunification of families now separated by our outmoded immigration laws.

Mr. President, along with many other Senators, I am cosponsor of the pending legislation proposed to carry out the recommendations of President Johnson.

I strongly urge that this bill be given top priority for consideration. We must right this wrong that stains our national conscience and blurs our image as the greatest democracy in the world. Let us remember at all times, we are the Nation which chiseled on our Statue of Liberty:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free;
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me;
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

FLOOD DISASTER IN WESTERN STATES

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Christmas week flood in the States of California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, mobilized the efforts of several Federal departments in an effort to reduce damage. The Office of Emergency Planning has compiled a preliminary report indicating that total damage in the four States is approximately \$574 million.

Federal, State, and local agencies of government cooperated to the fullest extent during the flood crisis, thus reducing the toll taken by floodwaters. Citizens of the Western States have a gratitude to the dedicated public servants who took part in this flood fighting task.

Although the initial report from the Office of Emergency Planning is admittedly preliminary and incomplete, the heavy damage is evidence that Congress must act immediately to supply emergency funds for recovery and rehabilitation of the area. According to the report, highway damage was especially heavy in the States of Oregon and Washington. It is estimated that highways in these two States were damaged to the extent of \$135 million and nearly a year will be required to accomplish effective restoration of the highway systems. It is essential that we move rapidly to restore this key portion of the West's transportation system.

The preliminary report also indicates extensive damage to federally owned fa-

cilities throughout the western region and these must be rebuilt so their functions and operations can continue. In order that Members of the Senate may know the extent of damage to public and private property in the four Western States, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD with my remarks a copy of a letter which I received from Deputy Director Franklin B. Dryden of the Office of Emergency Planning on January 8.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF
THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING,
Washington, D.C., January 8, 1965.
Hon. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Since flooding began last month in the States of California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, representatives of the Office of Emergency Planning and other Federal departments have been in the disaster area assisting State and local authorities in the unprecedented task of flood fighting, rescue, and evacuation.

As a result of President Johnson's declaration of "major disaster" (under Public Law 81-875) in all four States, full Federal support has been mobilized to aid in the task of debris clearance, recovery, and rehabilitation.

Continuing rains and snow pose a constant threat in the disaster area and accurate estimates of damage are impossible until waters recede. It will be several weeks before reliable damage estimates are available.

Information now at hand—admittedly preliminary and incomplete—suggest total damage in the four States approximating \$574,030,000 as follows:

State	Public	Private	Total
California.....	\$175,000,000	\$125,000,000	\$300,000,000
Oregon.....	136,000,000	120,500,000	256,500,000
Washington.....	9,000,000	1,000,000	10,000,000
Idaho.....	5,530,000	2,000,000	7,530,000
Total.....	325,530,000	248,500,000	574,030,000

There is extensive damage to highway and railroad transportation systems in the affected States; many bridges have been destroyed, railroads beds have been swept away and Federal-aid highways, State, county, and timber access roads have been severely damaged.

On Tuesday, January 5, OEP convened a meeting of representatives of all Federal Departments with major disaster responsibilities. In addition to OEP, represented at the meeting were: Agriculture, Commerce, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Defense (Corps of Engineers), Interior, Labor, Small Business Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Also present were representatives of the American Red Cross and the Bureau of the Budget. All actions taken to date and contemplated in the next few weeks were reviewed and approved. A summary of those actions by Department follows:

AGRICULTURE

The Department estimates \$100 million damage to farm and forest areas in the four States. A donated feed grain program has been initiated to sustain stranded livestock in Humboldt County, Calif. Further livestock feed requirements in the rural areas are being investigated. In excess of 500 tons of Government-owned food supplies have been made available to sustain the population.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 111

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JANUARY 15, 1965

No. 10

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, January 18, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

Senate

FRIDAY, JANUARY 15, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Holy One, whose sanctuary is the spirit of man: When there comes a sense of Thy searching presence, we know that only from strands of penitence and forgiveness can there be woven a garment of righteousness to cover our selfish and willful hearts.

Toiling amid the pressures of epochal days, we humbly invoke Thy guidance, as with a sense of awesome responsibility there are faced in this forum of a nation's will the thorny problems of our shadowed and saddened world.

These are the sins we fain would have Thee take away—

Malice and cold disdain; hot anger, sullen hate;

Scorn of the lowly, envy of the great; And discontent that casts a shadow, gray On all the brightness of a common day.

We ask it in the spirit of the One who mirrored Thy goodness in a human life. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 12, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

IMMIGRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 52)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States relating to immigration. Inasmuch as the message has been read in the House of Representatives, without objection, the message will be referred, without reading.

There being no objection, the message was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

A change is needed in our laws dealing with immigration. Four Presidents have called attention to serious defects in this legislation. Action is long overdue.

I am therefore submitting, at the outset of this Congress, a bill designed to correct the deficiencies. I urge that it be accorded priority consideration.

The principal reform called for is the elimination of the national origins quota system. That system is incompatible with our basic American tradition.

Over the years the ancestors of all of us—some 42 million human beings—have migrated to these shores. The fundamental, longtime American attitude has been to ask not where a person comes from but what are his personal qualities. On this basis men and women migrated from every quarter of the globe. By their hard work and their enormously varied talents they hewed a great nation out of a wilderness. By their dedication to liberty and equality, they created a society reflecting man's most cherished ideals.

Long ago the poet Walt Whitman spoke our pride: "These States are the amplest poem." We are not merely a nation but a "Nation of nations."

Violation of this tradition by the national origins quota system does incalculable harm. The procedures imply that men and women from some countries are, just because of where they come from, more desirable citizens than others. We have no right to disparage the ancestors of millions of our fellow Americans in this way. Relationships with a number of countries, and hence the success of our foreign policy, is needlessly impeded by this proposition.

The quota system has other grave defects. Too often it arbitrarily denies us immigrants who have outstanding and sorely needed talents and skills. I do not believe this is either good government or good sense.

Thousands of our citizens are needlessly separated from their parents or other close relatives.

To replace the quota system, the proposed bill relies on a technique of preferential admissions based upon the advantage to our Nation of the skills of the immigrant, and the existence of a close family relationship between the immigrant and people who are already citizens or permanent residents of the United States. Within this system of preferences, and within the numerical and other limitations prescribed by law, the issuance of visas to prospective immigrants would be based on the order of their application.

First preference under the bill would be given to those with the kind of skills or attainments which make the admission especially advantageous to our society. Other preferences would favor close relatives of citizens and permanent residents, and thus serve to promote the reuniting of families—long a primary goal of American immigration policy. Parents of U.S. citizens could obtain

admission without waiting for a quota number.

Transition to the new system would be gradual, over a 5-year period. Thus the possibility of abrupt changes in the pattern of immigration from any nation is eliminated. In addition, the bill would provide that as a general rule no country could be allocated more than 10 percent of the quota numbers available in any one year.

In order to insure that the new system would not impose undue hardship on any of our close allies by suddenly curtailing their emigration, the bill authorizes the President, after consultation with an Immigration Board established by the legislation, to utilize up to 30 percent of the quota numbers available in any year for the purpose of restoring cuts made by the new system in the quotas established by existing law.

Similar authority, permitting the reservation up to 10 percent of the numbers available in any year, would enable us to meet the needs of refugees fleeing from catastrophe or oppression.

In addition, the bill would:

First. Permit numbers not used by any country to be made available to countries where they are needed;

Second. Eliminate the discriminatory Asia-Pacific triangle provisions of the existing law;

Third. Eliminate discrimination against newly independent countries of the Western Hemisphere by providing nonquota status for natives of Jamaica, Trinidad, and Tobago;

Fourth. Afford nonquota status to parents of citizens, and fourth preference to parents of resident aliens;

Fifth. Eliminate the requirement that skilled first-preference immigrants needed in our economy must actually find an employer here before they can come to the United States;

Sixth. Afford a preference to workers with lesser skills who can fill specific needs in short supply;

Seventh. Eliminate technical restrictions that have hampered the effective use of the existing fair-share refugee law; and

Eighth. Authorize the Secretary of State to require reregistration of quota immigrant visa applicants and to regulate the time of payment of visa fees.

This bill would not alter in any way the many limitations in existing law which prevent an influx of undesirables and safeguard our people against excessive or unregulated immigration. Nothing in the legislation relieves any immigrant of the necessity of satisfying all of the security requirements we now have, or the requirements designed to exclude persons likely to become public charges. No immigrants admitted under this bill could contribute to unemployment in the United States.

The total number of immigrants would not be substantially changed. Under this bill, authorized quota immigration, which now amounts to 158,361 per year, would be increased by less than 7,000.

I urge the Congress to return the United States to an immigration policy which both serves the national interest and continues our traditional ideals. No

move could more effectively reaffirm our fundamental belief that a man is to be judged—and judged exclusively—on his worth as a human being.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 13, 1965.

S. —

A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 201(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175, 8 U.S.C. 1151(a)) be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 201. (a) The annual quota of any quota area shall be the same as that which existed for that area upon enactment of subsection (f) of this section: *Provided*, That the minimum quota for any quota area shall be two hundred: *Provided further*, That beginning with the first fiscal year commencing after the enactment of subsection (f) of this section and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years the annual quota of every quota area shall be reduced by 20 per centum of its present number for each such fiscal year. The quota numbers so deducted from quotas of quota areas shall be added to the quota reserve established by subsection (f) of this section and shall be available for distribution in accordance with the provisions thereof."

Sec. 2. Section 201(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175, 8 U.S.C. 1151(b)) is amended by substituting "section 202(d)" for "section 202(e)" after the words "provided for in".

Sec. 3. Section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175, 8 U.S.C. 1151) is amended by adding the following additional subsection:

"(f) Quota numbers made available at the commencement of any fiscal year as a result of the reduction of the annual quota of any quota areas pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, together with quota numbers not issued or otherwise used during the previous fiscal year, shall then be made available (1) during the five fiscal years following the enactment of this subsection, to quota immigrants, if otherwise admissible under the provisions of this Act, who are unable to obtain prompt issuance of visas due to oversubscription of their quotas or subquotas as determined by the Secretary of State, and (2), thereafter, to quota immigrants if otherwise admissible under the provisions of this Act. These quota numbers shall be allocated within the percentage limitations and in the order of priority specified in section 203 without regard to the quota to which the alien is chargeable: *Provided*, however, that the combined number of quota numbers issued to any quota area in any year, under the provisions of this subsection and subsection (a) of this section, shall not exceed 10 per centum of the total quota numbers authorized for that year: *Provided further*, That in no case shall this limitation operate to reduce any quota in any of the five fiscal years following the enactment of this Act by more than the 20 per centum specified in subsection (a) of this section: *Provided further*, That the President may, after consultation with the Immigration Board, reserve—

"(1) Not to exceed 30 per centum of such numbers for allocation to quota immigrants, if otherwise admissible under the provisions of this Act, whose admission is determined by him to be required (A) to avoid undue hardship, resulting from the reduction of annual quotas pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, which is not otherwise avoided under the provisions of this subsection, and (B) in the national security interest of the United States: *Provided*, That the limitation on immigration

from any single quota area in any year included in the first proviso to this subsection shall not apply to visas issued under this clause; and

"(2) Not to exceed 10 per centum of such numbers for allocation to quota immigrants, if otherwise admissible under the provisions of this Act, whose admissions will further the traditional policy of the United States of offering asylum and refuge to persons oppressed or persecuted, or threatened with oppression or persecution, because of their race, color, religion, national origin, adherence to democratic beliefs, or their opposition to totalitarianism or dictatorship, and to persons uprooted by natural calamity or military operations who are unable to return to their usual place of abode. After consultation with the Attorney General, the Secretary of State shall establish by regulation the requirements for qualification within this class, with reference to current world conditions.

In no case shall the authority to reserve such numbers, or the limitation on the combined number of quota numbers to be issued to any quota area in any year, operate so as to require that authorized quota numbers be unused."

Sec. 4. Section 201(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 176, 8 U.S.C. 1151(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"There shall be made available for the issuance of immigrant visas to quota immigrants (1) in any fiscal year no more quota numbers than the total quota for such year, and (2) in any calendar month of any fiscal year, no more quota numbers than 10 per centum of the total quota for such year in addition to that portion of the quota authorized for issuance but not issued during any preceding calendar month or months of the same fiscal year; except that during the last two months of any fiscal year immigrant visas may be issued without regard to the 10 per centum limitation contained herein."

Sec. 5. Section 201(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175, 8 U.S.C. 1151(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"A quota immigrant visa shall not be issued to any alien who is eligible for a nonquota immigrant visa."

Sec. 6(a). Section 202(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 176, 8 U.S.C. 1152(a)) is amended by deleting paragraph (5) thereof.

(b) Section 202(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 177, 8 U.S.C. 1152(b)) is repealed.

(c) Section 202(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 177, 8 U.S.C. 1152(c)) is redesignated section 202(b) and is amended to read as follows:

"Any immigrant born in a colony or other component or dependent area of a governing country for which no separate or specific quota has been established, unless a nonquota immigrant as provided in section 101 (a) (27) of this Act, shall be chargeable to the quota of the governing country, except that no more persons born in any such colony or other component or dependent area overseas from the governing country shall be chargeable to the quota of its governing country in any one year than a number which bears the same relation to the quota of its governing country as the number two hundred bears to the quota of the governing country prior to the enactment of this Act."

(d) Section 202(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 178, 8 U.S.C. 1152(d)) is redesignated section 202(c).

(e) Section 202(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 178), as amended (75 Stat. 654), (8 U.S.C. 1152(e)) is redesignated section 202(d) and is further amended by substituting "section 202(b)" for "section 202(c)(1)" after the words "issued under."

1965

673

SEC. 7. Section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 181, 8 U.S.C. 1157) is amended by deleting the words "no immigrant visa shall be issued in lieu thereof to any other immigrant" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "an immigrant visa may be issued in lieu thereof to any other immigrant".

SEC. 8. Paragraph (27) (A) of section 101 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 169, 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(27) (A) is amended to read as follows:

"(A) An immigrant who is the child, spouse, or parent of a citizen of the United States;"

SEC. 9. Paragraph (27) (C) of section 101 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 169, 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(27) (C) is amended to read as follows:

"(C) An immigrant who was born in any independent foreign country of North, Central, or South America, or in any independent island country adjacent thereto, or in the Canal Zone, and the spouse and children of any such immigrant, if accompanying or following to join him;"

SEC. 10. (a) Section 203(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 178, 8 U.S.C. 1153(a)(1)) is amended by deleting the words "needed urgently in" and substituting the words "especially advantageous to".

(b) Section 203(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 178), as amended (73 Stat. 644), (8 U.S.C. 1153(a)(2)), is amended by deleting the words "parents of citizens of the United States, such citizens being at least twenty-one years of age or who are the".

(c) Section 203(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 178), as amended (73 Stat. 644), (8 U.S.C. 1153(a)(4)) is amended by—

(1) inserting after the words "married daughters of citizens of the United States" a comma, followed by the words "or parents of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence," and

(2) adding at the end thereof the following:

"Qualified quota immigrants capable of performing specified functions for which a shortage of employable and willing persons exists in the United States shall be entitled to a preference not to exceed 50 per centum of the immigrant visas remaining available for issuance under this paragraph after the preference to the named relatives of United States citizens and resident aliens is satisfied or exhausted."

SEC. 11. Section 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 179, 8 U.S.C. 1154) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by deleting the words "or section 203(a)(1) (A)" and substituting a comma, followed by the words "section 203(a)(1) (A) or the last clause of section 203(a)(4)".

(2) Subsection (b) is amended (A) by deleting the words "section 203(a)(1) (A)" and substituting the words "the last clause of section 203(a)(4)" and (B) by inserting after the words "required by the Attorney General" the words "after consultation with the Immigration Board."

(3) Subsection (c) is redesignated (d) and is amended to read as follows:

"(d) After an investigation of the facts in each case, and after consultation with appropriate agencies of the Government, the Attorney General shall, if he determines that the facts stated in the petition are true and that the alien in respect of whom the petition is made is eligible for an immigrant status under section 101(a)(27) (F) (1), section 203(a)(1) (A) or the last clause of section 203(a)(4) approve the petition and forward one copy thereof to the Department of State. The Secretary of State shall then authorize the consular officer concerned to grant such immigrant status. The Attorney

General shall forward to the Congress a report on each approved petition for immigrant status under section 203(a)(1) stating the basis for his approval and such facts as were by him deemed to be pertinent in establishing the beneficiary's qualifications for the preferential status. Such reports shall be submitted to the Congress on the first and fifteenth day of each calendar month in which the Congress is in session."

(4) Subsection (d) is redesignated (e) and is amended by deleting the words "or section 203(a)(1) (A)," and substituting a comma, followed by the words "section 203(a)(1) (A) or the last clause of section 203(a)(4)".

(5) The following new subsection is inserted after subsection (b):

"(c) Any immigrant claiming in his application to be entitled to an immigrant visa under section 203(a)(1) (A) of the Act shall file a petition with the Attorney General. The petition shall be in such form as the Attorney General may by regulations prescribe and shall contain such additional information and be supported by such documentary evidence as may be required by the Attorney General. The petition shall be made under oath administered by any individual having authority to administer oaths, if executed in the United States, but, if executed outside of the United States, administered by a consular officer."

SEC. 12. The first sentence of section 205 (b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 180), as amended (73 Stat. 644), (8 U.S.C. 1155(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Any citizen of the United States claiming that any immigrant is his spouse, child, or parent, and that such immigrant is entitled to a nonquota immigrant status under section 101(a)(27) (A) of this Act, or any citizen of the United States claiming that any immigrant is his unmarried son or unmarried daughter and that such immigrant is entitled to a quota immigrant status under section 203(a)(2) of this Act, or any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence claiming that any immigrant is his spouse or his unmarried son or unmarried daughter and that such immigrant is entitled to a quota immigrant status under section 203(a)(3) of this Act, or any citizen of the United States claiming that any immigrant is his brother or sister or his married son or his married daughter and that such immigrant is entitled to a preference under section 203(a)(4) of this Act, or any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence claiming that any immigrant is his parent and that such immigrant is entitled to a preference under section 203(a)(4) of this Act, may file a petition with the Attorney General."

SEC. 13. Section 1 of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 504), is amended to read as follows:

"That (a) under the terms of Section 212 (d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act the Attorney General may parole into the United States, pursuant to such regulations as he may prescribe, an alien refugee-escapee defined in subsection (b) of this section, if such alien (1) applies for parole while physically present within the limits of any country which is not Communist, dominated, or Communist-occupied, and (2) is not a national of the area in which the application is made.

"(b) For the purposes of subsection (a), the term 'refugee-escapee' means any alien who, because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion has fled or shall flee (A) from any Communist, Communist-dominated, or Communist-occupied area, or (B) from any country within the general area of the Middle East, and who cannot return to such area, or to such country, on account of race, religion, or political opinion. The expression 'general area of the Middle East' means the area

between and including (1) Morocco on the west, (2) Turkey on the north, (3) Pakistan on the east, and (4) Saudi Arabia and Ethiopia on the south."

SEC. 14. Section 2 of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 504), as amended (76 Stat. 124), is amended by deleting (1) the letter "(a)" immediately following the words "Sec. 2," and (2) subsection (b) thereof.

SEC. 15. Section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 230, 8 U.S.C. 1351) is amended as follows:

(1) Immediately after "Sec. 281." insert "(a)".

(2) Paragraph (2) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) For the issuance of each immigrant visa, \$20; except that such fee shall be \$10 in the case of any alien who is the beneficiary of a petition required under sections 204(b) or 205(b)."

(3) The following is inserted after paragraph (7), and is designated subsection (b):

"The time and manner of payment of the fees specified in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) of this section, including but not limited to partial deposit or prepayment at the time of registration, or postponement for an appropriate period, shall be prescribed by the Secretary of State."

(4) The paragraph beginning with the words "The fees * * *" is designated subsection (c).

SEC. 16. Section 203(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 179, 8 U.S.C. 1153(c)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The Secretary of State, in his discretion, may terminate the registration on a quota waiting list of any alien who fails to evidence his continued intention to apply for a visa in such manner as may be by regulation prescribed."

SEC. 17. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 182, 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(1)) is amended by deleting the language "feeble-minded" and inserting the language "mentally retarded" in its place.

(b) Paragraph (4) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 182, 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(4)) is amended by deleting the word "epilepsy" and the commas before and after it.

(c) Section 212 (f), (g), and (h) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by the Act of September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 654, 655, 8 U.S.C. 1182) are hereby redesignated sections 212 (g), (h), and (i), respectively, and section 212(g) as so redesignated is amended to read as follows:

"Any alien who is excludable from the United States under paragraphs (1), (2), (3), or (4) of subsection (a) of this section, and any alien afflicted with tuberculosis in any form, who (A) is the spouse or the unmarried son or daughter, or the minor unmarried lawfully adopted child, of a United States citizen, or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or of an alien who has been issued an immigrant visa, or (B) has a son or daughter who is a United States citizen, or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or an alien who has been issued an immigrant visa, may, if otherwise admissible, be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence in accordance with such terms, conditions, and controls, including the giving of a bond, as the Attorney General, in his discretion, may be regulations prescribe, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service."

SEC. 18. (a) There is hereby established the Immigration Board (hereafter referred to as the "Board") to be composed of seven members. The President of the United States shall appoint the Chairman of the Board and two other members. The President of the Senate, with the approval of

the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, shall appoint two members from the membership of the Senate. The Speaker of the House of Representatives, with the approval of the majority and minority leaders of the House, shall appoint two members from the membership of the House. The members of the Board shall be selected by virtue of their high personal integrity, their capabilities, and their experience in and expert knowledge of immigration laws and international migration problems. A vacancy in the membership of the Board shall be filled in the same manner as the original designation and appointment.

(b) The duties of the Board shall be—

(1) to promulgate, after consultation with the Attorney General, such regulations as are necessary to insure its efficient functioning under the provisions of this Act;

(2) to make a continuous study of such conditions within and without the United States, which, in the opinion of the Board, might have any bearing on the immigration policy of the United States;

(3) to consider, after consultation with the Secretary of State, to recommend to the President, such allocation of quota immigrant visas, under section 201(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as will best fulfill the purposes of that section;

(4) to consider, and after consultation with the Secretaries of Labor, State, and Defense, to recommend to the Attorney General such criteria for admission of immigrants under section 203(a)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, and the last clause of section 203(a)(4), as amended, as will further the policy of the United States to secure the immigration of persons of high skill, education, or training, or who are capable of performing specified functions for which a shortage of employable, willing persons exists in the United States;

(5) to study such other aspects of the Immigration and Nationality Act as the President shall assign to the Board for study, and make recommendations with respect thereto;

(6) to conduct such investigations and to hold such public and executive hearings in such places within and without the United States and at such times as the Board deems necessary.

(c) All Federal agencies shall cooperate fully with the Board to the end that it may effectively carry out its duties.

(d) Each member of the Board who is not otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall receive the sum of \$75 for each day spent in the work of the Board, shall be paid actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses, when away from his usual place of residence, in accordance with section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended.

(e) Each member of the Board who is otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for such other service, but while engaged in the work of the Board shall be paid actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses, when away from his usual place of residence, in accordance with the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended.

(f) There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

Sec. 19. Section 221(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 192, 8 U.S.C. 1201(g)) is amended by deleting the period at the end thereof and adding the following:

“Provided further, That a visa may be issued to an alien defined in section 101(a)(15)(B) or (F), if such alien is otherwise entitled to receive a visa, upon receipt of a

notice by the consular officer from the Attorney General of the giving of a bond with sufficient surety in such sum and containing such conditions as the consular officer shall prescribe, to insure that at the expiration of the time for which such alien has been admitted by the Attorney General, as provided in section 214(a), or upon failure to maintain the status under which he was admitted, or to maintain any status subsequently acquired under section 248 of the Act, such alien will depart from the United States.”

Sec. 20. So much of section 272(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 226, 8 U.S.C. 1322(a)) as precedes the words “shall pay to the collector of customs” is amended to read as follows:

“Sec. 272. (a) Any person who shall bring to the United States an alien (other than an alien crewman) who is (1) mentally retarded, (2) insane, (3) afflicted with psychopathic personality, (4) a chronic alcoholic, (5) afflicted with any dangerous contagious disease, or (6) a narcotic drug addict.”

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1 amends section 201(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, under which quotas for each country are determined. It abolishes the national origins system by reducing present quotas by one-fifth of their present number each year for 5 years. As numbers are released from national origins quotas, they are added to the quota reserve pool established by the amendment to section 201 of the act made by section 3 of the bill. Thus in the first year, 20 percent (roughly 32,000) are released to the pool; in the second year, the pool will have 40 percent of present quotas (or 64,000); until in the fifth year and thereafter, all numbers are allocated through the pool. To provide some immediate relief to minimum quota areas, the minimum quota is raised to 200, but is then reduced in the same manner as other quotas.

Section 2 amends section 201(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act by changing a reference therein from “section 202(e)” to “section 202(d)” in conformity with the redesignation of section 202(e) as 202(d) made by section 6(e) of the bill.

Section 3 amends section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act by adding a new subsection (f). This subsection establishes the quota reserve pool from which all quota numbers will be allocated by the fifth year. In each of the 5 years constituting the period of transition, the pool will consist of (1) the numbers released from national origins quotas each year, and (2) numbers assigned to the old quota areas but unused the previous year because insufficient demand for them existed in the assigned quota area.

Quota numbers are issued in the order of preference specified in amended section 203 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (see section 10 of the bill). That is, first call on the first 50 percent is given to persons whose admission, by virtue of their exceptional skill, training or education, will be especially advantageous to the United States; first call on the next 30 percent, plus any part of the first 50 percent not issued for first preference purposes, is given to unmarried sons and daughters of U.S. citizens, not eligible for nonquota status because they are over 21 years of age; first call on the remaining 20 percent, plus any part of the first 80 percent not taken by the first two preference classes, is given to spouses and unmarried sons or daughters of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence; and any portion remaining is issued to other quota visa applicants, with percentage preferences to other relatives of U.S. citizens and resident aliens, and then to certain classes of workers. Amended section 203 further provides that within each class, visas are issued in the order in which ap-

plied for—first come, first served. These preference provisions, which under present law determine only relative priority between nationals of the same country, will now determine priority between nationals of different countries throughout the world.

To prevent disproportionate benefits to the nationals of any single country, a maximum of 10 percent of the total authorized quota is set on immigration attributable to any quota area. However, this limitation is not applied if to do so would result in reducing any quota at a more rapid rate than that provided by amended section 201(a). Ultimately, of course, the limitation applies to all.

Exceptions to the principle of allocating visas on the basis of time of registration within preference classes are provided to deal with special problems. Since some countries' quotas are not current, their nationals have no old registrations on file. To apply the principle rigidly would result, after 4 or 5 years, in curtailing immigration from these countries almost entirely. This would be undesirable not only because it would frustrate the aim of the bill that immigration from all countries should continue, but also because many of the countries that would be affected are our closest allies. Therefore, proposed section 201(f) would authorize the President, after consultation with the Immigration Board (established by section 18), to reserve up to 30 percent of the quota reserve pool for allocation to qualified immigrants (1) who could obtain visas under the existing system but not under the new system and (2) whose admission to the United States would further the national security interest by maintaining close ties with their countries. The number of quota visas so allocated may exceed the 10-percent limit on the number of immigrants from any country in the case of those countries which, under the existing system, regularly receive allocations in excess of that limit.

Subsection (f) also allows the President to reserve up to 10 percent of the quota reserve pool for allocation to certain refugees and permits him to disregard priority of registration within preference classes for the benefit of such refugees. Many refugees, almost by definition, are uprooted suddenly. They had no thought of immigration until they were forced to leave the country in which they were living because of natural calamity or political upheaval; or they may be refugees from persecution or dictatorship, in which case previous registration would have been dangerous.

Finally, subsection (f) provides that if the President reserves, against contingencies, any numbers during the year, but thereafter finds them not to be needed for the named purposes, such numbers are to be issued as if they had not been reserved. Similarly, the 10-percent limitation on the number of visas to be issued to any quota area is made inoperable if its application would result in authorized quota numbers not being used.

Section 4 amends section 201(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which presently limits the number of quota visas issued in any single month to 10 percent of the total yearly quota. This limitation is needed to insure that persons entitled to preference by virtue of special skills or family ties will not be foreclosed from preference by a rush of earlier applications which exhaust the annual quota. To insure that all available quota numbers can nevertheless be utilized, present law provides that numbers not used during the first 10 months of any fiscal year may be used during the last 2 months of such year, without regard to the 10 percent monthly limitation. Often, if close to the full 10 percent of quota visas is not issued in each of the first months of the year, undesirable administrative problems result in the last 2. The amendment

1965

allows the issuance each month of the 10 percent authorized for that month plus any visas authorized but not issued in previous months. This permits a more even spacing of visa issuance during the year.

Section 5 amends section 201(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act which now permits the issuance of quota immigrant visas to nonquota immigrants. Substituted for the provisions of section 201(d) is a specific direction that no quota immigrant visa shall be issued to a person who is eligible for a nonquota immigrant visa. This will prevent nonquota immigrants from preempting visas to the prejudice of qualified quota immigrants.

Section 6 amends section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the so-called Asia-Pacific triangle provisions, which require persons of Asian stock to be attributed to quota areas not by their place of birth, but according to their racial ancestry. At the end of the 5-year transition period, this provision would be in any event superfluous, since national origin will no longer be a standard for the admission of qualified quota immigrants. But the formula is so especially discriminatory that it should be removed immediately, and not be permitted to operate even in part during the 5-year transition period.

Subsection (c) of the section amends section 202(c) of the act so as to raise the minimum allotment to subquotas of dependent areas of a governing country, thus preserving their present equality with independent minimum-quota areas. The dependent area's allotment is taken from the governing country's quota. To prevent a dependent area from preempting the governing country's quota disproportionately, it is provided that the dependent area's share of the quota will decrease as the governing country's quota is reduced.

Section 7 amends section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act by deleting the language of that section which prevents the issuance of visas in lieu of those issued but not actually used, or later found to be improperly issued. Thus, in Germany alone over 7,000 quota visas are now taken by persons entitled to nonquota status, and 2,000 more quota visas are issued to persons who do not actually apply for admission to the United States. All these quota visas are lost under the present law. Such a result is inconsistent with the aim of the bill that all authorized quota numbers shall be used. The amended section 207 specifically authorizes the issuance of a quota visa in lieu of one improperly issued or not actually used, utilizing the same quota number.

Section 8 amends section 101(a)(27)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which grants nonquota status to spouses and children of U.S. citizens, so as to extend nonquota status to parents of U.S. citizens as well.

Section 9 amends section 101(a)(27)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to extend nonquota status to natives of all independent Western Hemisphere countries. Under present law, such status is granted to natives of all independent North, Central, and South American countries, and of named Caribbean island countries which were independent when the Immigration and Nationality Act was enacted in 1952. The amendment extends nonquota status to natives of countries in these areas which have gained their independence since then, or may gain their independence hereafter.

Section 10 amends section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which establishes preferences for immigrants with special skills and for relatives of U.S. citizens and resident aliens.

Subsection (a) relaxes the test for the first preference accorded to persons of high education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability. Under present

law, such persons are granted preferred status only if the Attorney General determines that their services are needed urgently in the United States. The amendment allows them first preference if their services, as determined by the Attorney General, would be especially advantageous to the United States.

Subsection (b) eliminates the second preference for parents of American citizens, now accorded nonquota status by the amendment made by section 8 of the bill.

Subsection (c) grants a fourth preference, up to 50 percent of numbers not issued to the first three preferences, to parents of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence. It also grants a subsidiary preference to qualified quota immigrants capable of filling particular labor shortages in the United States. Under present law, immigrants who do not meet the rigorous standards of the skilled specialist category are not preferred over any other immigrants even though they can fill a definite labor need which other immigrants cannot fill. The amendment allows to such immigrants a preference of 50 percent of the quota visas remaining after all family preferences have been satisfied or exhausted.

Section 11 amends section 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which establishes the procedure for determining eligibility for preferred status under section 203.

The amendments made by paragraphs (1), (2), (3) and (4) cover the filing of petitions, on behalf of the workers accorded a fourth preference, by the persons who will employ them to fill the special labor needs. Paragraph (1) provides for approval of these petitions by the Attorney General, and paragraph (2) requires that he consult with the Immigration Board and interested departments of Government before granting preference to these workers.

Paragraph (2) also exempts first preference skilled specialists from the present petition procedure because under the bill a new procedure is established for such persons. Under present law, skilled specialists may qualify for preferred status only when a petition requesting their services is filed by a U.S. employer. This requirement unduly restricts our ability to attract those whose services would substantially enhance our economy, cultural interests, and welfare. Many of these people have no way of contacting employers in the United States in order to obtain the required employment. Even if they knew whom to contact, few openings important enough to attract such highly skilled people are offered without personal interviews, and only a few very large enterprises or institutions have representatives abroad with hiring authority. Thus many such skilled specialists who cannot obtain the employment presently required for first preference status.

Moreover, the requirement of prearranged employment is in fact unnecessary. Highly skilled specialists would obviously work at their specialty, provided that employment is open. The only check needed is that the Attorney General ascertain, upon consultation with appropriate Government agencies, that job openings exist in the specialist's particular field. Although the present petition procedure serves to confirm the individual's own evidence of his training, education, or skills, such confirmation is not essential if proper investigation is made of his qualifications before the preference is accorded.

Paragraph (5), therefore, allows the Attorney General to grant a first preference to skilled specialists upon their own petitions, supported by such documentation as the Attorney General shall require. In this connection it is to be noted that the existing law requiring an investigation by the Attorney General of the petitioner's qualifications and a determination of his eligibility for a first preference is continued.

Section 12 amends section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, providing for petitions to establish eligibility for preference as a relative of a U.S. citizen or lawfully resident alien, to conform to the substantive amendments made by section 10.

Section 13 amends the fair share refugee law so as to remove a provision which has hampered its effective operation. Presently, the entry of refugees is subject to the condition that they be within the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. The mandate provision is eliminated, so that the refugee law will no longer be subject to outside control. In addition, subsection (b) enlarges the applicable area definition so as to allow the entry of refugees from north Africa generally, and Algeria particularly, who are unable to return to their countries because of their race, religion, or political opinions, and incorporates this new definition in the fair share law. The existing definition encompasses refugees from "any country within the general area of the Middle East," which is defined as the area between Libya on the west, Turkey on the north, Pakistan on the east, and Saudi Arabia and Ethiopia on the south. The new definition substitutes Morocco for Libya as the western border of this area.

Section 14 repeals the fair share law's special provision for 500 "difficult to resettle" refugees; all such persons have been taken care of, and the authority is therefore no longer necessary.

Section 15 amends section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to grant discretionary authority to the Secretary of State to specify the time and manner of payment of the fees for visa applications and issuances. This discretionary authority will allow the Secretary to control two undesirable situations:

First, many people in countries with over-subscribed quotas register their names on visa waiting lists even though they have no present intention of emigrating; they regard the registration as insurance for possible future use. Such registrations have the effect of creating a distorted picture of visa backlogs and make efficient administration difficult. The amendment therefore would allow the Secretary of State to require a registrant to deposit a fee at the time of registration. While not unduly burdensome on those who wish to come here, such a procedure would serve to discourage registrations which are not bona fide.

Second, otherwise admissible immigrants, particularly refugees, are often unable to pay the required visa fee. Rather than bar them from obtaining a visa, the Secretary is given authority to postpone payment.

Section 16 is also directed to the problem of insurance registrations. Many applicants for visas have been offered visas repeatedly but have turned them down. They wish only to preserve their priority in registration for possible future use. To handle such cases, section 208(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended so as to allow the Secretary of State to terminate the registrations of persons who have previously declined visas. This amendment is also important in connection with a contemplated reregistration of applicants in certain over-subscribed quota areas designed to ascertain whether registrants have died, emigrated elsewhere, or changed their minds; the Secretary is authorized to terminate the registration of all persons who fail to reregister.

Section 17 amends subsections (a)(1), (a)(4), and (g), as redesignated, of section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to allow the entry of certain mentally afflicted persons. Under present law, no visas may be issued to aliens who are feeble-minded or insane, or have had one or more attacks of insanity, or who are afflicted with a psychopathic personality, epilepsy, or a

January 15

mental defect. These provisions have created hardships for families seeking admission, where one member, often a child, is retarded. Such families are presented with the difficult decision as to whether they should leave the afflicted person behind or stay with him. Such a person cannot enter the United States even if the family is willing and able to care for him here and even if he is within the 85 percent of mentally afflicted persons whose condition can be substantially improved by adequate treatment.

The amendment gives the Attorney General discretionary authority to admit such persons who are the spouses, children, or parents of citizens or resident aliens, or who are accompanying a member of their family. The Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, would prescribe the controls and conditions on the entry of such persons, including the giving of a bond to insure continued family support.

The bar against the admission of epileptics is removed entirely, since this affliction can effectively be medically controlled. The amendment would also provide that the term "mentally retarded" be substituted for the present term "feeble-minded." This is not a substantive change in the law.

Section 18 establishes the Immigration Board, to be composed of seven members. Two members of the House of Representatives are appointed by the Speaker with the approval of the majority and minority leaders, two members of the Senate, by the President of the Senate, with the approval of the majority and minority leaders, and three members, including the Chairman, by the President. Members not otherwise in Government service are to be paid on a per diem basis for actual time spent in the work of the Board.

The section provides that the Board's duties shall be to study, and consult with appropriate Government departments on all facets of immigration policy; to make recommendations to the President as to the reservation and allocation of quota numbers, and to recommend to the Attorney General criteria for admission of skilled specialists and workers whose services are needed by reason of labor shortages in this country.

Section 19 grants consular officers discretionary authority to require bonds insuring that certain nonimmigrants will depart voluntarily from the United States when required. This amendment to section 221(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, by providing an additional safeguard against a later refusal to depart, would allow the issuance of visas in many borderline cases in which visas are now refused to students and visitors.

Section 20 amends section 272 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which imposes a penalty on carriers bringing to the United States aliens afflicted with certain defects, so as to make that section conform with the changes made by this bill and section 11 of the act of September 26, 1961.

FOREIGN AID—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 53)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

We live in a turbulent world. But amid the conflict and confusion, the United States holds firm to its primary goal—a world of stability, freedom, and peace where independent nations can enjoy the benefits of modern knowledge.

Here is our difference with the Communists—and our strength. They would use their skills to forge new chains of tyranny. We would use ours to free men from the bonds of the past.

The Communists are hard at work to dominate the less-developed nations of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Their allies are the ancient enemies of mankind: Tyranny, poverty, ignorance, and disease. If freedom is to prevail, we must do more than meet the immediate threat to free world security, whether in southeast Asia or elsewhere. We must look beyond—to the long-range needs of the developing nations.

Foreign assistance programs reach beyond today's crises, to offer: Strength to those who would be free; hope for those who would otherwise despair; progress for those who would help themselves.

Through these programs we help build stable nations in a stable world.

Acting on the experience of the past 4 years, I am presenting a program which: Is selective and concentrated; emphasizes self-help and the fastest possible termination of dependence on aid; provides an increasing role for private enterprise; improves multilateral coordination of development aid; reflects continuing improvement in management.

Specifically, for fiscal year 1966, I recommend:

No additional authorizations for development lending or the Alliance for Progress; existing authorizations for those purposes are adequate; authorizations of \$1,170 million for military assistance; \$369 million for supporting assistance; \$210 million for technical cooperation; \$155 million for contributions to international organizations; \$50 million for the President's contingency fund; and \$62 million for administrative and miscellaneous expenses.

I am also requesting a special standby authorization for use if necessary in Vietnam only.

My appropriation request for fiscal year 1966 under these authorizations is for \$3,380 million; \$1,170 million will be used for military assistance; \$2,210 million is for the other categories of aid.

This is a minimum request, the smallest in the history of the foreign aid program. It is \$136 million less than requested last year, and will impose the smallest assistance burden on the American people since the beginning of the Marshall plan in 1948.

This minimum request reflects my determination to present to the Congress the lowest aid budget consistent with the national interest. It takes full account of the increasing efficiency of the assistance program, and the increasing availability of assistance funds from international agencies in which the costs are shared among a number of countries.

I believe that in carrying out this program the American people will get full value for their money. Indeed, we cannot afford to do less. Russia and Red China have tripled their promises of aid in the past year. They are doing more

than they have ever done before; the competition between them has led to increased efforts by each to influence the course of events in the developing nations.

If, during the year, situations should arise which require additional amounts of U.S. assistance to advance vital U.S. interests, I shall not hesitate to inform the Congress and request additional funds.

III

I am requesting \$1,170 million for the military assistance program. This is an increase of \$115 million over the total appropriation for military assistance for the current fiscal year. In order to meet urgent requirements in southeast Asia during fiscal year 1966, we cut back programs in other countries which are under pressure. Some of the fiscal year 1966 appropriation will be needed to make up what we have left undone.

Still, the program is highly concentrated. Nearly three-quarters of the money will go to 11 countries around the great arc from Greece to Korea. Vietnam alone will absorb an important share.

Military assistance makes it possible for nations to survive. It provides a shield behind which economic and social development can take place. It is vital to our own security as well. It helps to maintain more than 3½ million men under arms as a deterrent to aggression in countries bordering on the Sino-Soviet world. Without them, more American men would have to be stationed overseas, and we would have to spend far more for defense than we now do.

IV

As a supplement to military assistance, I am requesting \$369 million for supporting assistance—economic aid which is directly related to the maintenance of stability and security. Eighty-eight percent of the money will be used in Vietnam, Laos, Korea, and Jordan.

V

The world's trouble spots—the Vietnams and the Congos—dominate the headlines. This is no wonder, for they represent serious problems. Over \$500 million of the current request for military and supporting assistance will be deployed to meet the frontal attack in Vietnam and Laos.

Indeed, \$500 million may not be enough. I am therefore requesting for fiscal year 1966 an additional standby authorization for military or supporting assistance which would be used only in Vietnam and only in case we should need more funds to protect our interests there. Any program which would make use of this additional authorization will be presented to the authorizing committees of the Congress concurrently with the appropriation request.

Our past investment in the defense of the free world through the military assistance and supporting assistance programs has paid great dividends. Not only has it foiled aggression, but it has brought stability to a number of countries. Since the beginning of this decade, the funds used each year for military aid and supporting assistance have been sharply reduced. Today, we are spend-

1965

Population distribution

	1963	Percent of U.S. totals	1970	Percent of U.S. totals
Northeastern States: 9	46,372,000	24.80	49,750,000	23.90
North Central States: 12	52,890,000	28.05	55,710,000	26.75
South Atlantic States: 8 plus Dis- trict of Columbia	27,705,000	14.60	31,680,000	15.20
South Central States: 8	30,612,000	16.18	33,345,000	16.01
West (mountains and Pacific): 13	31,052,000	16.47	37,765,000	18.13
Total	188,531,000	100.00	208,260,000	100.00
Pacific States: 5	23,408,000	12.42	28,490,000	13.66
California	17,670,000	9.37	21,690,000	10.89

NOTE.—The percentage growth rate of the West is climbing, while other areas are growing at a much slower rate. Again, the northeastern and north central regions will experience a decrease in percentage growth.

Projected rank of the 10 leading States in population and projected total retail sales estimates for 1965 and 1970

1965 rank	State	1965 population (thousands)	1970 rank	1970 population (thousands)	Retail sales estimate (millions)	
					1965	1970
1	California	18,520	1	21,462	\$31,978	\$40,250
2	New York	17,784	2	18,708	27,863	31,270
3	Pennsylvania	11,783	3	11,930	15,960	18,235
4	Illinois	10,625	5	11,687	17,395	18,500
5	Texas	10,404	6	11,331	14,764	17,265
6	Ohio	10,260	4	11,856	15,157	15,763
7	Michigan	8,754	7	9,589	11,202	11,565
8	New Jersey	6,687	8	7,287	10,629	11,900
9	Florida	5,828	9	6,112	9,670	13,800
10	Massachusetts	5,555	10	5,650	8,148	8,630

NOTE.—By 1970, California will have pulled away from any competitor in population and sales volume.

Selected marketing power of San Francisco and the metropolitan area

RETAIL SALES VOLUME

	1958 U.S. census	1964 estimate	1965 estimate
San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area	Thousands \$3,502,707	Thousands \$4,670,925	Thousands \$4,782,560
City of San Francisco	1,253,977	1,795,695	1,830,806

POPULATION, INCOME AND HOUSEHOLDS

	1960 U.S. census	1965 esti- mate	1960 esti- mate (thou- sands)	1965 esti- mate (thou- sands)	Number of house- holds	1965 estimated income per house- hold
San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area	2,648,762	3,032,157	3,552,942	10,793,569	1,003,901	\$9,675
City of San Francisco	740,316	755,122	3,070,520	3,623,214	297,815	10,949

San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area—5 county bay area
(San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo), 1963
estimates

	Bay area totals	San Francisco County	San Francisco as percent of bay area totals
Households	953,900	293,000	32.4
Population	2,890,100	750,000	25.7
Families	953,900	293,000	30.7
Retail sales ¹	\$4,440,205	\$1,408,645	31.7
Food sales ¹	1,067,024	277,881	26.0
Packaged liquor stores ¹	120,095	33,120	25.8
General merchandise ¹	671,472	273,371	40.7
Apparel ¹	282,795	126,152	44.6
Furniture-household-radio ¹	245,659	87,616	35.6
Automotive ¹	745,620	176,298	23.7
Gas stations ¹	303,819	63,382	20.8
Lumber-building-hardware ¹	368,299	27,378	16.7
Drugs ¹	150,298	40,513	26.9
Net effective buying income ¹	8,159,745	2,383,278	29.2
Net effective buying income per capita	2,823	3,198	
Net effective buying income per family	8,554	8,134	

¹ In thousands of dollars.

Distribution of coins to the Federal Reserve banks, fiscal year 1963

Federal Reserve districts	Numbers of coins	Percent of U.S. total
1. Boston	198,470,000	5.52
2. New York	478,224,000	13.30
3. Philadelphia	284,273,826	7.90
4. Cleveland	249,350,000	6.93
5. Richmond	241,164,000	6.71
6. Atlanta	314,920,000	8.76
7. Chicago	509,527,000	14.17
8. St. Louis	208,630,000	5.80
9. Minneapolis	120,380,000	3.35
10. Kansas City	194,156,649	5.40
11. Dallas	194,925,000	5.42
12. San Francisco	602,173,254	16.74
Total	3,595,193,729	100.00

NOTE.—The San Francisco Federal Reserve District received the greatest amount of coin distribution in fiscal year 1963. See next page for fiscal year 1964 distribution.

Populations and distribution of coins to the Federal Reserve banks,
fiscal year 1964

Federal Reserve districts	Population (in thousands)	Percent of U.S. total	Pieces of coins re- ceived (millions)	Percent of mint pro- duction
1. Boston	9,775	5.5	224	5.2
2. New York	21,852	12.3	527	12.3
3. Philadelphia	9,465	5.3	244	5.7
4. Cleveland	14,864	8.4	285	6.7
5. Richmond	10,259	9.1	395	9.2
6. Atlanta	18,120	10.1	428	10.0
7. Chicago	26,132	14.7	594	13.8
8. St. Louis	10,782	6.1	294	6.8
9. Minneapolis	6,245	3.5	145	3.4
10. Kansas City	9,498	5.3	229	5.3
11. Dallas	11,170	6.3	212	4.9
12. San Francisco	23,707	13.3	719	16.7
Total	177,874	99.9	4,297	100.0

NOTE.—Again, the San Francisco Federal Reserve district received the highest distribution of coin production. The population estimate for Federal Reserve districts was made in early 1963. In 1965, using the projected rate of increase, the population of the San Francisco Federal Reserve district is expected to equal the estimated population of the Chicago Federal Reserve district, its nearest competitor.

Estimates of new coin requirements by Federal Reserve banks for
fiscal years 1965 and 1966

[In thousands of dollars]

Districts	1965	1966
1. Boston	10,751	10,976
2. New York	49,594	49,494
3. Philadelphia	80,190	84,103
4. Cleveland	36,966	34,750
5. Richmond	18,325	18,740
6. Atlanta	33,643	38,729
7. Chicago	55,964	31,935
8. St. Louis	19,750	21,474
9. Minneapolis	12,585	11,210
10. Kansas City	26,500	24,500
11. Dallas	28,907	27,157
12. San Francisco	55,400	55,000
Total	428,385	408,065

PRACTICAL METHOD FOR ESTABLISHING WATER SYSTEMS FOR THE RURAL AREAS OF AMERICA

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and myself, I am introducing a bill which presents a practical method for establishing water systems for the rural areas of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 493) to assist in the development of adequate rural water systems, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this bill is offered as an amendment to the Rural Electrification Administration Act and will, when approved, be one of the greatest stimulants, to the healthy growth of our Nation.

With an increase of a hundred million in population anticipated during the next generation, the question of where these people will live constitutes one of our gravest problems. The crowding of populations into great cities already has created what is probably the world's greatest crisis. The logical place for our expanding population to live is in the presently underpopulated areas.

Congress recognized this fact when it established the REA program which has proved its worth many times over. We have also improved our rural telephone service and our highway systems.

Full development of the most desirable areas in which to live cannot proceed until we have the foresight to conserve and make available through local systems the water resources of each area.

The bill which Senator MANSFIELD and I are introducing will make a major contribution to this end. It will be a major weapon in the war on unemployment, creating far more employment than the REA program, which has added billions of dollars each year to the economy of the country. It will furnish jobs for hundreds of thousands of people, urban as well as rural.

BILL TO MEET URBAN AND COMMUNITY PROBLEMS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the increasingly urgent problems of urbanization can be most effectively met by creation of an office within the Executive Office of the President which would function somewhat along the lines of the Bureau of the Budget.

The growing complexities of urbanization are both directly and indirectly affected by a growing number of Federal programs dealing with schools, crime, health, highways, airports, railroads, enforcement of fair labor standards, and many others.

Many mayors and other local and civic leaders have also appealed for a "one-stop service" in Washington where they can take their problems, have them evaluated, and referred to the proper agencies.

Another problem has been the growing need for long-range planning and research to enable us to foresee problems before they arise, and have appropriate remedies ready, as well as achieving greater efficiency and economy.

For these reasons, I am, today, introducing a bill which will authorize formation of an Office of Community Development in the Executive Office of the President.

My proposal is designed to meet the problems of urbanization without creation of a vast, sprawling, and expensive new Federal bureaucracy—with more marble buildings and a new proliferation of long, chauffeur-driven black limousines for a burgeoning mass of new officeholders. Rather than building this huge new bureaucratic establishment, it would create an executive staff to cut across established bureaucratic lines, to coordinate the many and diverse Federal programs which affect the problems of urbanization, and to assist local officials in present problems and foresee and prepare to cope with future problems.

I have pressed for this type of legislation before and my present bill conforms with a pledge I made to the people of Pennsylvania last fall, and I urge its early consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 497) to establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of Community Development, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED GREAT BASIN NATIONAL PARK IN WHITE PINE COUNTY IN EASTERN NEVADA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to create the Great Basin National Park in White Pine County in eastern Nevada.

Six years ago, I introduced legislation providing for a survey to determine the region's feasibility as a national park. The Advisory Board on National Parks recommended to the Secretary of the Interior that this area, known as the Wheeler Peak-Lehman Caves region, be included in the national parks system.

The Board considered the geological and ecological aspects of the 123,000-acre "sky island," in the heart of the Great Basin Desert, of national significance, making it suitable for preservation under the National Park Service.

Dr. Adolph Murie, an internationally known naturalist, who conducted the survey, listed the following reasons for his conclusions:

The spectacular view of mountain ranges and valleys across the central Great Basin, combined with natural park areas of forests, streams and lakes appropriate for camping, picnicking, hiking and exploration of nature, are in themselves of national park caliber.

The area includes half a dozen splendid stands of bristlecone pines believed to be the oldest living things on earth.

The Wheeler area is the superb example of Great Basin country, illustrating well the geological process of basin and range formation, having good examples of various types of rock and geologic structure, and illustrating the representative Great Basin vegetation and wildlife.

In addition, the area includes a small but active desert-bound glacier in the deep cirque of Wheeler Peak, 13,063 feet above sea level, and a limestone arch big enough to cover a six-story building.

During the past several years, extensive hearings in the field have been held to attempt to reconcile the divergent views of the conservationists on the one hand, and local mining and grazing interests on the other.

In order to protect the possibility of establishing a valuable industry that could employ as many as 400 men in this presently depressed mining area, I have included in the present measure a section that would permit the continuation of prospecting, exploration and mining within the park, limiting the activity to that necessary to the actual process of valid mining requirements.

Likewise, I have included a section that would permit present grazers to continue the use of the park area for 25 years plus the lifetime of the holders of grazing permits.

Both of these sections have precedent in other areas and cannot be considered an innovation in the establishment of national parks.

Mr. President, an identical measure passed the Senate on January 25, 1962, but failed to secure approval of the House of Representatives.

In view of the accepted urgency to protect great natural assets such as the area under consideration, I am hopeful that favorable action will be had during the 89th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 499) to establish the Great Basin National Park in Nevada, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENTS OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on Wednesday of this week President Johnson sent to the Congress his strong recommendation for revision of our basic immigration law. Today it is my privilege and pleasure to introduce the bill designed to carry out the recommendations contained in that message—a bill the President asks be accorded priority consideration.

I send this bill to the desk on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from

1965

691

New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], and myself.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this bill remain at the desk until the end of business on Monday, January 25, so that others who wish too may join in sponsoring it.

Also, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the President's immigration message, the text of the bill, and a section-by-section analysis of the bill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. It is to be expected many inquiries concerning the bill will be made of the Members of the Senate. I hope this Record will be of help in making replies.

Mr. President, the time has long passed for the Congress to act to change our basic immigration quota system. The new immigration policies proposed by President Johnson are designed to meet the modern manpower needs of the Nation, support our foreign policy objectives, and reflect the humanitarian principles which the American people have so often supported in meeting urgent refugee and emergency immigration needs.

It is my belief that the vast majority of Americans long ago rejected the narrow, fear-ridden view that is reflected in the continuance of an immigration policy based on the national origins concept. Most of our citizens agree with the President that a qualified newcomer to our shores should not be asked where he was born or how he spells his name, but rather what he can do for America.

I would like to comment, Mr. President, that the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who is not able to be here today, telephoned to assure me of his full support for this immigration reform bill, and offered to participate and cooperate in any way that can be helpful in bringing this legislation to the Senate floor this session, and in obtaining final congressional approval. Since coming to the Senate, and before, Senator KENNEDY has been one of the most outstanding and loyal supporters for immigration reform. He carries on in a very great tradition, for there were few subjects more personally sensitive to President Kennedy than the prejudice and discrimination of the na-

tional origins quota system. All of us are grateful for the support and cooperation of our good friend from Massachusetts, and each of us wish him the very best in his final phase of recuperation from his most unfortunate accident. I know he intends to return to the Senate next week and has indicated to me that one of the first orders of business for him will be to make a major statement on behalf of this immigration bill, and the need for immigration reform. I look forward with great anticipation to that statement, because I—and I am sure most of the Senate—will not soon forget that moving and powerful statement he delivered last year on behalf of the civil rights bill which I feel had tremendous national and international effect, and greatly aided the cause of equality and justice in our Nation. We will be working with Senator KENNEDY in the days ahead toward what I hope will be a successful conclusion to this longstanding battle for immigration reform.

With the introduction of this bill, I ask the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee to promptly schedule administration and public witnesses who wish to be heard on this legislation. As a high priority item in the President's legislative program, there is every reason to have expeditious hearings and early committee consideration.

Last, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the strong editorial, captioned "I Lift My Lamp," from the New York Times of yesterday be printed at the conclusion of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will remain at the desk as requested, and the President's message, the bill, the analysis, and the editorial will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 500) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HART (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 201(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175, 8 U.S.C. 1151(a)) be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 201. (a) The annual quota of any quota area shall be the same as that which existed for that area upon enactment of subsection (f) of this section: *Provided*, That the minimum quota for any quota area shall be two hundred: *Provided further*, That beginning with the first fiscal year commencing after the enactment of subsection (f) of this section and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years the annual quota of every quota area shall be reduced by twenty per centum of its present number for each such fiscal year. The quota numbers so deducted from quotas of quota areas shall be added to the quota reserve established by subsection (f) of this section and shall be available for distribution in accordance with the provisions thereof."

SEC. 2. Section 201(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175, 8 U.S.C. 1151(b)) is amended by substituting "section 202(d)" for "section 202(e)" after the words "provided for in".

SEC. 3. Section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175, 8 U.S.C. 1151) is amended by adding the following additional subsection:

"(f) Quota numbers made available at the commencement of any fiscal year as a result of the reduction of the annual quota of any quota areas pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, together with quota numbers not issued or otherwise used during the previous fiscal year, shall then be made available (1) during the five fiscal years following the enactment of this subsection, to quota immigrants, if otherwise admissible under the provisions of this Act, who are unable to obtain prompt issuance of visas due to oversubscription of their quotas or subquotas as determined by the Secretary of State, and (2), thereafter, to quota immigrants if otherwise admissible under the provisions of this Act. These quota numbers shall be allocated within the percentage limitations and in the order of priority specified in section 203 without regard to the quota to which the alien is chargeable: *Provided, however*, That the combined number of quota numbers issued to any quota area in any year, under the provisions of this subsection and subsection (a) of this section, shall not exceed ten per centum of the total quota numbers authorized for that year: *Provided further*, That in no case shall this limitation operate to reduce any quota in any of the five fiscal years following the enactment of this Act by more than the twenty per centum specified in subsection (a) of this section: *Provided further*, That the President may, after consultation with the Immigration Board, reserve—

"(1) Not to exceed thirty per centum of such numbers for allocation to quota immigrants, if otherwise admissible under the provisions of this Act, whose admission is determined by him to be required (A) to avoid undue hardship, resulting from the reduction of annual quotas pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, which is not otherwise avoided under the provisions of this subsection, and (B) in the national security interest of the United States: *Provided*, That the limitation on immigration from any single quota area in any year included in the first proviso to this subsection shall not apply to visas issued under this clause; and

"(2) Not to exceed ten per centum of such numbers for allocation to quota immigrants, if otherwise admissible under the provisions of this Act, whose admissions will further the traditional policy of the United States of offering asylum and refuge to persons oppressed or persecuted, or threatened with oppression or persecution, because of their race, color, religion, national origin, adherence to democratic beliefs, or their opposition to totalitarianism or dictatorship, and to persons uprooted by natural calamity or military operations who are unable to return to their usual place of abode. After consultation with the Attorney General, the Secretary of State shall establish by regulation the requirements for qualification within this class, with reference to current world conditions.

In no case shall the authority to reserve such numbers, or the limitation on the combined number of quota numbers to be issued to any quota area in any year, operate so as to require that authorized quota numbers be unused."

SEC. 4. Section 201(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 176, 8 U.S.C. 1151(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"There shall be made available for the issuance of immigrant visas to quota immigrants (1) in any fiscal year no more quota numbers than the total quota for such year, and (2) in any calendar month of any fiscal year, no more quota numbers than ten per centum of the total quota for such year in addition to that portion of the quota authorized for issuance but not issued during any

preceding calendar month or months of the same fiscal year, except that during the last two months of any fiscal year immigrant visas may be issued without regard to the ten per centum limitation contained herein."

Sec. 5. Section 201(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175, 8 U.S.C. 1151(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"A quota immigrant visa shall not be issued to any alien who is eligible for a non-quota immigrant visa."

Sec. 6. (a) Section 202(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 176, 8 U.S.C. 1152(a)) is amended by deleting paragraph (5) thereof.

(b) Section 202(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 177, 8 U.S.C. 1152(b)) is repealed.

(c) Section 202(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 177, 8 U.S.C. 1152(c)) is redesignated section 202(b) and is amended to read as follows:

"Any immigrant born in a colony or other component or dependent area of a governing country for which no separate or specific quota has been established, unless a non-quota immigrant as provided in section 101 (a) (27) of this Act, shall be chargeable to the quota of the governing country, except that no more persons born in any such colony or other component or dependent area overseas from the governing country shall be chargeable to the quota of its governing country in any one year than a number which bears the same relation to the quota of its governing country as the number two hundred bears to the quota of the governing country prior to the enactment of this Act."

(d) Section 202(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 178, 8 U.S.C. 1152(d)) is redesignated section 202(c).

(e) Section 202(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 178), as amended (75 Stat. 654), (8 U.S.C. 1152(e)) is redesignated section 202(d) and is further amended by substituting "section 202(b)" for "section 202(c) (1)" after the words "issued under."

Sec. 7. Section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 181, 8 U.S.C. 1157) is amended by deleting the words "no immigrant visa shall be issued in lieu thereof to any other immigrant" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "an immigrant visa may be issued in lieu thereof to any other immigrant."

Sec. 8. Paragraph (27) (A) of section 101 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 169, 8 U.S.C. 1101(a) (27) (A)) is amended to read as follows:

"(A) An immigrant who is the child, spouse, or parent of a citizen of the United States;"

Sec. 9. Paragraph (27) (C) of section 101 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 169, 8 U.S.C. 1101(a) (27) (C)) is amended to read as follows:

"(C) An immigrant who was born in any independent foreign country of North, Central, or South America, or in any independent island country adjacent thereto, or in the Canal Zone, and the spouse and children of any such immigrant, if accompanying or following to join him;"

Sec. 10. (a) Section 203(a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 178, 8 U.S.C. 1153(a) (1)) is amended by deleting the words "needed urgently in" and substituting the words "especially advantageous to"

(b) Section 203(a) (2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 178), as amended (73 Stat. 644), (8 U.S.C. 1153(a) (2)), is amended by deleting the words "parents of citizens of the United States, such citizens being at least twenty-one years of age or who are the"

(c) Section 203(a) (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 178), as amended (73 Stat. 644), (8 U.S.C. 1153(a) (4)) is amended by—

(1) inserting after the words "married daughters of citizens of the United States" a comma, followed by the words "or parents of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence," and

(2) adding at the end thereof the following:

"Qualified quota immigrants capable of performing specified functions for which a shortage of employable and willing persons exists in the United States shall be entitled to a preference not to exceed 50 per centum of the immigrant visas remaining available for issuance under this paragraph after the preference to the named relatives of United States citizens and resident aliens is satisfied or exhausted."

Sec. 11. Section 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 179, 8 U.S.C. 1154) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by deleting the words "or section 203(a) (1) (A)" and substituting a comma, followed by the words "section 203(a) (1) (A) or the last clause of section 203(a) (4)."

(2) Subsection (b) is amended (A) by deleting the words "section 203(a) (1) (A)" and substituting the words "the last clause of section 203(a) (4)" and (B) by inserting after the words "required by the Attorney General" the words "after consultation with the Immigration Board."

(3) Subsection (c) is redesignated (d) and is amended to read as follows:

"(d) After an investigation of the facts in each case, and after consultation with appropriate agencies of the Government, the Attorney General shall, if he determines that the facts stated in the petition are true and that the alien in respect of whom the petition is made is eligible for an immigrant status under section 101(a) (27) (F) (i), section 203(a) (1) (A) or the last clause of section 203(a) (4) approve the petition and forward one copy thereof to the Department of State. The Secretary of State shall then authorize the consular officer concerned to grant such immigrant status. The Attorney General shall forward to the Congress a report on each approved petition for immigrant status under section 203(a) (1) stating the basis for his approval and such facts as were by him deemed to be pertinent in establishing the beneficiary's qualifications for the preferential status. Such reports shall be submitted to the Congress on the first and fifteenth day of each calendar month in which the Congress is in session."

(4) Subsection (d) is redesignated (e) and is amended by deleting the words "or section 203(a) (1) (A)," and substituting a comma, followed by the words "section 203(a) (1) (A) or the last clause of section 203(a) (4)."

(5) The following new subsection is inserted after subsection (b):

"(c) Any immigrant claiming in his application to be entitled to an immigrant visa under section 203(a) (1) (A) of the Act shall file a petition with the Attorney General. The petition shall be in such form as the Attorney General may by regulations prescribe and shall contain such additional information and be supported by such documentary evidence as may be required by the Attorney General. The petition shall be made under oath administered by any individual having authority to administer oaths, if executed in the United States, but, if executed outside of the United States, administered by a consular officer."

Sec. 12. The first sentence of section 205 (b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 180), as amended (73 Stat. 644, 8 U.S.C. 1155(b)), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Any citizen of the United States claiming that any immigrant is his spouse, child, or parent, and that such immigrant is entitled to a nonquota immigrant status under section 101(a) (27) (A) of this Act, or any citizen of the United States claiming that any immigrant is his unmarried son or

unmarried daughter and that such immigrant is entitled to a quota immigrant status under section 203(a) (2) of this Act, or any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence claiming that any immigrant is his spouse or his unmarried son or unmarried daughter and that such immigrant is entitled to a quota immigrant status under section 203(a) (3) of this Act, or any citizen of the United States claiming that any immigrant is his brother or sister or his married son or his married daughter and that such immigrant is entitled to a preference under section 203(a) (4) of this Act, or any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence claiming that any immigrant is his parent and that such immigrant is entitled to a preference under section 203(a) (4) of this Act, may file a petition with the Attorney General."

Sec. 13. Section 1 of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 504), is amended to read as follows:

"That (a) under the terms of section 212 (d) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act the Attorney General may parole into the United States, pursuant to such regulations as he may prescribe, an alien refugee-escapee defined in subsection (b) of this section, if such alien (1) applies for parole while physically present within the limits of any country which is not Communist, Communist dominated, or Communist occupied, and (2) is not a national of the area in which the application is made."

"(b) For the purposes of subsection (a), the term 'refugee-escapee' means any alien who, because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion has fled or shall flee (A) from any Communist, Communist-dominated, or Communist-occupied area, or (B) from any country within the general area of the Middle East, and who cannot return to such area, or to such country, on account of race, religion, or political opinion. The expression 'general area of the Middle East' means the area between and including (1) Morocco on the west, (2) Turkey on the north, (3) Pakistan on the east, and (4) Saudi Arabia and Ethiopia on the south."

Sec. 14. Section 2 of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 504), as amended (76 Stat. 124), is amended by deleting (1) the letter "(a)" immediately following the words "Sec. 2," and (2) subsection (b) thereof.

Sec. 15. Section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 230, 8 U.S.C. 1351) is amended as follows:

(1) Immediately after "Sec. 281," insert "(a)".

(2) Paragraph (2) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) For the issuance of each immigrant visa, \$20; except that such fee shall be \$10 in the case of any alien who is the beneficiary of a petition required under sections 204(b) or 205(b)."

(3) The following is inserted after paragraph (7), and is designated subsection (b): "The time and manner of payment of the fees specified in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) of this section, including but not limited to partial deposit or prepayment at the time of registration, or postponement for an appropriate period, shall be prescribed by the Secretary of State."

(4) The paragraph beginning with the words "The fees * * *" is designated subsection (c).

Sec. 16. Section 203(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 179, 8 U.S.C. 1153(c)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The Secretary of State, in his discretion, may terminate the registration on a quota waiting list of any alien who fails to evidence his continued intention to apply for a visa in such manner as may be by regulation prescribed."

Sec. 17. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality

1965

Act (66 Stat. 182, 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(1)) is amended by deleting the language "feeble-minded" and inserting the language "mentally retarded" in its place.

(b) Paragraph (4) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 182, 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(4)) is amended by deleting the word "epilepsy" and the commas before and after it.

(c) Section 212 (f), (g) and (h) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by the Act of September 26, 1961, (75 Stat. 654, 655, 8 U.S.C. 1182) are hereby redesignated sections 212 (g), (h), and (i), respectively, and section 212(g) as so redesignated is amended to read as follows:

"Any alien who is excludable from the United States under paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (a) of this section, and any alien afflicted with tuberculosis in any form, who (A) is the spouse or the unmarried son or daughter, or the minor unmarried lawfully adopted child, of a United States citizen, or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or of, an alien who has been issued an immigrant visa, or (B) has a son or daughter who is a United States citizen, or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or an alien who has been issued an immigrant visa, may, if otherwise admissible, be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence in accordance with such terms, conditions, and controls, including the giving of a bond, as the Attorney General, in his discretion, may by regulations prescribe, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service."

Sec. 18. (a) There is hereby established the Immigration Board (hereafter referred to as the "Board") to be composed of seven members. The President of the United States shall appoint the Chairman of the Board and two other members. The President of the Senate, with the approval of the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, shall appoint two members from the membership of the Senate. The Speaker of the House of Representatives, with the approval of the majority and minority leaders of the House, shall appoint two members from the membership of the House. The members of the Board shall be selected by virtue of their high personal integrity, their capabilities, and their experience in and expert knowledge of immigration laws and international migration problems. A vacancy in the membership of the Board shall be filled in the same manner as the original designation and appointment.

(b) The duties of the Board shall be—

(1) to promulgate, after consultation with the Attorney General, such regulations as are necessary to insure its efficient functioning under the provisions of this Act;

(2) to make a continuous study of such conditions within and without the United States, which, in the opinion of the Board, might have any bearing on the immigration policy of the United States;

(3) to consider, after consultation with the Secretary of State, to recommend to the President, such allocation of quota immigrant visas, under section 201(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as will best fulfill the purposes of that section;

(4) to consider, and after consultation with the Secretaries of Labor, State, and Defense, to recommend to the Attorney General such criteria for admission of immigrants under section 203(a)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, and the last clause of section 203(a)(4), as amended, as will further the policy of the United States to secure the immigration of persons of high skill, education, or training, or who are capable of performing specified functions for which a shortage of employable, willing persons exists in the United States;

(5) to study such other aspects of the Immigration and Nationality Act as the President shall assign to the Board for study, and make recommendations with respect thereto;

(6) to conduct such investigations and to hold such public and executive hearings in such places within and without the United States and at such times as the Board deems necessary.

(c) All Federal agencies shall cooperate fully with the Board to the end that it may effectively carry out its duties.

(d) Each member of the Board who is not otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall receive the sum of \$75 for each day spent in the work of the Board, shall be paid actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses, when away from his usual place of residence, in accordance with section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended.

(e) Each member of the Board who is otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for such other service, but while engaged in the work of the Board shall be paid actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses, when away from his usual place of residence, in accordance with the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended.

(f) There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

SEC. 19. Section 221(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 192, 8 U.S.C. 1201(g)) is amended by deleting the period at the end thereof and adding the following:

"Provided further, That a visa may be issued to an alien defined in section 101(a)(15) (B) or (F), if such alien is otherwise entitled to receive a visa, upon receipt of a notice by the consular officer from the Attorney General of the giving of a bond with sufficient surety in such sum and containing such conditions as the consular officer shall prescribe, to insure that at the expiration of the time for which such alien has been admitted by the Attorney General, as provided in section 214(a), or upon failure to maintain the status under which he was admitted, or to maintain any status subsequently acquired under section 248 of the Act, such alien will depart from the United States."

SEC. 20. So much of section 272(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 226, 8 U.S.C. 1322(a)) as precedes the words "shall pay to the collector of customs" is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 272. (a) Any person who shall bring to the United States an alien (other than an alien crewman) who is (1) mentally retarded, (2) insane, (3) afflicted with psychopathic personality, (4) a chronic alcoholic, (5) afflicted with any dangerous contagious disease, or (6) a narcotic drug addict,"

To the Congress of the United States:

A change is needed in our laws dealing with immigration. Four Presidents have called attention to serious defects in this legislation. Action is long overdue.

I am therefore submitting, at the outset of this Congress, a bill designed to correct the deficiencies. I urge that it be accorded priority consideration.

The principal reform called for is the elimination of the national origins quota system. That system is incompatible with our basic American tradition.

Over the years the ancestors of all of us—some 42 million human beings—have migrated to these shores. The fundamental, longtime American attitude has been to ask not where a person comes from but what are his personal qualities. On this basis men and women migrated from every quarter of

the globe. By their hard work and their enormously varied talents they hewed a great nation out of the wilderness. By their dedication to liberty and equality, they created a society reflecting man's most cherished ideals.

Long ago the poet, Walt Whitman, spoke our pride: "These States are the amplest poem." We are not merely a nation but a "nation of nations."

Violation of this tradition by the national origins quota system does incalculable harm. The procedures imply that men and women from some countries are, just because of where they come from, more desirable citizens than others. We have no right to disparage the ancestors of millions of our fellow Americans in this way. Relationships with a number of countries, and hence the success of our foreign policy, is needlessly impeded by this proposition.

The quota system has other grave defects. Too often it arbitrarily denies us immigrants who have outstanding and sorely needed talents and skills. I do not believe this is either good government or good sense.

Thousands of our citizens are needlessly separated from their parents or other close relatives.

To replace the quota system, the proposed bill relies on a technique of preferential admissions based upon the advantage of our Nation of the skills of the immigrant, and the existence of a close family relationship between the immigrant and people who are already citizens or permanent residents of the United States. Within this system of preferences, and within the numerical and other limitations prescribed by law, the issuance of visas to prospective immigrants would be based on the order of their application.

First preference under the bill would be given to those with the kind of skills or attainments which make the admission especially advantageous to our society. Other preferences would favor close relatives of citizens and permanent residents, and thus serve to promote the reuniting of families—long a primary goal of American immigration policy. Parents of U.S. citizens could obtain admission without waiting for a quota number.

Transition to the new system would be gradual, over a 5-year period. Thus, the possibility of abrupt changes in the pattern of immigration from any nation is eliminated. In addition, the bill would provide that as a general rule no country could be allocated more than 10 percent of the quota numbers available in any 1 year.

In order to insure that the new system would not impose undue hardship on any of our close allies by suddenly curtailing their emigration, the bill authorizes the President, after consultation with an Immigration Board established by the legislation, to utilize up to 30 percent of the quota numbers available in any year for the purpose of restoring cuts made by the new system in the quotas established by existing law.

Similar authority, permitting the reservation of up to 10 percent of the numbers available in any year, would enable us to meet the needs of refugees fleeing from catastrophe or oppression.

In addition, the bill would—

(1) Permit numbers not used by any country to be made available to countries where they are needed;

(2) Eliminate the discriminatory "Asia-Pacific triangle" provisions of the existing law;

(3) Eliminate discrimination against newly independent countries of the Western Hemisphere by providing nonquota status for natives of Jamaica, Trinidad, and Tobago;

(4) Afford nonquota status to parents of citizens, and fourth preference to parents of resident aliens;

January 15

(5) Eliminate the requirement that skilled first-preference immigrants needed in our economy must actually find an employer here before they can come to the United States;

(6) Afford a preference to workers with lesser skills who can fill specific needs in short supply;

(7) Eliminate technical restrictions that have hampered the effective use of the existing fair-share refugee law; and

(8) Authorize the Secretary of State to require reregistration of quota immigrant visa applicants and to regulate the time on payment of visa fees.

This bill would not alter in any way the many limitations in existing law which prevent an influx of undesirables and safeguard our people against excessive or unregulated immigration. Nothing in the legislation relieves any immigrant of the necessity of satisfying all of the security requirements we now have, or the requirements designed to exclude persons likely to become public charges. No immigrants admitted under this bill could contribute to unemployment in the United States.

The total number of immigrants would not be substantially changed. Under this bill, authorized quota immigration, which now amounts to 158,361 per year, would be increased by less than 7,000.

I urge the Congress to return the United States to an immigration policy which both serves the national interest and continues our traditional ideals. No move could more effectively reaffirm our fundamental belief that a man is to be judged—and judged exclusively—on his worth as a human being.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 13, 1965.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1 amends section 201(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, under which quotas for each country are determined. It abolishes the national origins system by reducing present quotas by one-fifth of their present number each year for 5 years. As numbers are released from national origins quotas, they are added to the quota reserve pool established by the amendment to section 201 of the act made by section 3 of the bill. Thus in the first year, 20 percent (roughly 32,000) are released to the pool; in the second year, the pool will have 40 percent of present quotas (or 64,000); until in the fifth year and thereafter, all numbers are allocated through the pool. To provide some immediate relief to minimum quota areas, the minimum quota is raised to 200, but is then reduced in the same manner as other quotas.

Section 2 amends section 201(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act by changing a reference therein from "section 202(e)" to "section 202(d)" in conformity with the redesignation of section 202(e) as 202(d) made by section 6(e) of the bill.

Section 3 amends section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act by adding a new subsection (f). This subsection establishes the quota reserve pool from which all quota numbers will be allocated by the fifth year. In each of the 5 years constituting the period of transition, the pool will consist of (1) the numbers released from national origins quotas each year, and (2) numbers assigned to the old quota areas but unused the previous year because insufficient demand for them existed in the assigned quota area.

Quota numbers are issued in the order of preference specified in amended section 203 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (see section 10 of the bill). That is, first call on the first 50 percent is given to persons whose admission, by virtue of their exceptional skill, training or education, will be especially advantageous to the United States; first call on the next 30 percent, plus any part of the

first 50 percent not issued for first preference purposes, is given to unmarried sons and daughters of United States citizens, not eligible for nonquota status because they are over 21 years of age; first call on the remaining 20 percent, plus any part of the first 80 percent not taken by the first two preference classes, is given to spouses and unmarried sons or daughters of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence; and any portion remaining is issued to other quota visa applicants, with percentage preferences to other relatives of U.S. citizens and resident aliens, and then to certain classes of workers. Amended section 203 further provides that within each class, visas are issued in the order in which applied for—first come, first served. These preference provisions, which under present law determine only relative priority between nationals of the same country, will now determine priority between nationals of different countries throughout the world.

To prevent disproportionate benefits to the nationals of any single country, a maximum of 10 percent of the total authorized quota is set on immigration attributable to any quota area. However, this limitation is not applied if to do so would result in reducing any quota at a more rapid rate than that provided by amended section 201(a). Ultimately, of course, the limitation applies to all.

Exceptions to the principle of allocating visas on the basis of time of registration within preference classes are provided to deal with special problems. Since some countries' quotas are not current, their nationals have no old registrations on file. To apply the principle rigidly would result, after 4 or 5 years, in curtailing immigration from these countries almost entirely. This would be undesirable not only because it would frustrate the aim of the bill that immigration from all countries should continue, but also because many of the countries that would be affected are our closest allies. Therefore, proposed section 201(f) would authorize the President, after consultation with the Immigration Board (established by section 18), to reserve up to 30 percent of the quota reserve pool for allocation to qualified immigrants (1) who could obtain visas under the existing system but not under the new system and (2) whose admission to the United States would further the national security interest by maintaining close ties with their countries. The number of quota visas so allocated may exceed the 10-percent limit on the number of immigrants from any country in the case of those countries which, under the existing system, regularly receive allocations in excess of that limit.

Subsection (f) also allows the President to reserve up to 10 percent of the quota reserve pool for allocation to certain refugees and permits him to disregard priority of registration within preference classes for the benefit of such refugees. Many refugees, almost by definition, are uprooted suddenly. They had no thought of immigration until they were forced to leave the country in which they were living because of natural calamity or political upheaval; or they may be refugees from persecution or dictatorship, in which case previous registration would have been dangerous.

Finally, subsection (f) provides that if the President reserves, against contingencies, any numbers during the year, but thereafter finds them not to be needed for the named purposes, such numbers are to be issued as if they had not been reserved. Similarly, the 10-percent limitation on the number of visas to be issued to any quota area is made inoperable if its application would result in authorized quota numbers not being used.

Section 4 amends section 201(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which presently limits the number of quota visas issued in any single month to 10 percent of

the total yearly quota. This limitation is needed to insure that persons entitled to preference by virtue of special skills or family ties will not be foreclosed from preference by a rush of earlier applications which exhaust the annual quota. To insure that all available quota numbers can nevertheless be utilized, present law provides that numbers not used during the first 10 months of any fiscal year may be used during the last 2 months of such year, without regard to the 10-percent monthly limitation. Often, if close to the full 10 percent of quota visas is not issued in each of the first months of the year, undesirable administrative problems result in the last two. The amendment allows the issuance each month of the 10 percent authorized for that month plus any visas authorized but not issued in previous months. This permits a more even spacing of visa issuance during the year.

Section 5 amends section 201(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act which now permits the issuance of quota immigrant visas to nonquota immigrants. Substituted for the provisions of section 201(d) is a specific direction that no quota immigrant visa shall be issued to a person who is eligible for a nonquota immigrant visa. This will prevent nonquota immigrants from preempting visas to the prejudice of qualified quota immigrants.

Section 6 amends section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the so-called "Asia-Pacific triangle" provisions, which require persons of Asian stock to be attributed to quota areas not by their place of birth, but according to their racial ancestry. At the end of the 5-year transition period, this provision would be in any event superfluous, since national origin will no longer be a standard for the admission of qualified quota immigrants. But the formula is so especially discriminatory that it should be removed immediately, and not be permitted to operate even in part during the 5-year transition period.

Subsection (c) of the section amends section 202(c) of the act so as to raise the minimum allotment to subquotas of dependent areas of a governing country, thus preserving their present equality with independent minimum-quota areas. The dependent area's allotment is taken from the governing country's quota. To prevent a dependent area from preempting the governing country's quota disproportionately, it is provided that the dependent area's share of the quota will decrease as the governing country's quota is reduced.

Section 7 amends section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act by deleting the language of that section which prevents the issuance of visas in lieu of those issued but not actually used, or later found to be improperly issued. Thus in Germany alone over 7,000 quota visas are now taken by persons entitled to nonquota status, and 2,000 more quota visas are issued to persons who do not actually apply for admission to the United States. All these quota visas are lost under the present law. Such a result is inconsistent with the aim of the bill that all authorized quota numbers shall be used. The amended section 207 specifically authorizes the issuance of a quota visa in lieu of one improperly issued or not actually used, utilizing the same quota number.

Section 8 amends section 101(a) (27) (A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which grants nonquota status to spouses and children of U.S. citizens, so as to extend non-quota status to parents of U.S. citizens as well.

Section 9 amends section 101(a) (27) (C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to extend nonquota status to natives of all independent Western Hemisphere countries. Under present law, such status is granted to natives of all independent North, Central, and South American countries, and of named

1965

695

Caribbean island countries which were independent when the Immigration and Nationality Act was enacted in 1952. The amendment extends nonquota status to natives of countries in these areas which have gained their independence since then, or may gain their independence hereafter.

Section 10 amends section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which establishes preferences for immigrants with special skills and for relatives of U.S. citizens and resident aliens.

Subsection (a) relaxes the test for the first preference accorded to persons of high education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability. Under present law, such persons are granted preferred status only if the Attorney General determines that their services are "needed urgently" in the United States. The amendment allows them first preference if their services, as determined by the Attorney General, would be "especially advantageous" to the United States.

Subsection (b) eliminates the second preference for parents of American citizens, now accorded nonquota status by the amendment made by section 8 of the bill.

Subsection (c) grants a fourth preference, up to 50 percent of numbers not issued to the first three preferences, to parents of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence. It also grants a subsidiary preference to qualified quota immigrants capable of filling particular labor shortages in the United States. Under present law, immigrants who do not meet the rigorous standards of the skilled specialist category are not preferred over any other immigrants even though they can fill a definite labor need which other immigrants cannot fill. The amendment allows to such immigrants a preference of 50 percent of the quota visas remaining after all family preferences have been satisfied or exhausted.

Section 11 amends section 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which establishes the procedure for determining eligibility for preferred status under section 203.

The amendments made by paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) cover the filing of petitions, on behalf of the workers accorded a fourth preference, by the persons who will employ them to fill the special labor needs. Paragraph (1) provides for approval of these petitions by the Attorney General, and paragraph (2) requires that he consult with the Immigration Board and interested departments of Government before granting preference to these workers.

Paragraph (2) also exempts first-preference skilled specialists from the present petition procedure because under the bill a new procedure is established for such persons. Under present law, skilled specialists may qualify for preferred status only when a petition requesting their services is filed by a U.S. employer. This requirement unduly restricts our ability to attract those whose services would substantially enhance our economy, cultural interests, and welfare. Many of these people have no way of contacting employers in the United States in order to obtain the required employment. Even if they knew whom to contact, few openings important enough to attract such highly skilled people are offered without personal interviews, and only a few very large enterprises or institutions have representatives abroad with hiring authority. Thus many such skilled specialists cannot obtain the employment presently required for first-preference status.

Moreover, the requirement of prearranged employment is in fact unnecessary. Highly skilled specialists would obviously work at their specialty, provided that employment is open. The only check needed is that the Attorney General ascertain, upon consulta-

tion with appropriate Government agencies, that job openings exist in the specialist's particular field. Although the present petition procedure serves to confirm the individual's own evidence of his training, education, or skills, such confirmation is not essential if proper investigation is made of his qualifications before the preference is accorded.

Paragraph (5), therefore, allows the Attorney General to grant a first preference to skilled specialists upon their own petitions, supported by such documentation as the Attorney General shall require. In this connection it is to be noted that the existing law requiring an investigation by the Attorney General of the petitioner's qualifications and a determination of his eligibility for a first preference is continued.

Section 12 amends section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, providing for petitions to establish eligibility for preference as a relative of a U.S. citizen or lawfully resident alien, to conform to the substantive amendments made by section 10.

Section 13 amends the "fair share" refugee law so as to remove a provision which has hampered its effective operation. Presently, the entry of refugees is subject to the condition that they be within the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. The mandate provision is eliminated, so that the refugee-law will no longer be subject to outside control. In addition, subsection (b) enlarges the applicable area definition so as to allow the entry of refugees from North Africa generally, and Algeria particularly, who are unable to return to their countries because of their race, religion, or political opinions, and incorporates this new definition in the "fair share" law. The existing definition encompasses refugees from "any country within the general area of the Middle East," which is defined as the area between Libya on the west, Turkey on the north, Pakistan on the east, and Saudi Arabia and Ethiopia on the south. The new definition substitutes Morocco for Libya as the western border of this area.

Section 14 repeals the "fair share" law's special provision for 500 "difficult to resettle" refugees; all such persons have been taken care of, and the authority is therefore no longer necessary.

Section 15 amends section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to grant discretionary authority to the Secretary of State to specify the time and manner of payment of the fees for visa applications and issuances. This discretionary authority will allow the Secretary to control two undesirable situations:

First, many people in countries with over-subscribed quotas register their names on visa waiting lists even though they have no present intention of emigrating; they regard the registration as "insurance" for possible future use. Such registrations have the effect of creating a distorted picture of visa backlogs and make efficient administration difficult. The amendment therefore would allow the Secretary of State to require a registrant to deposit a fee at the time of registration. While not unduly burdensome on those who wish to come here, such a procedure would serve to discourage registrations which are not bona fide.

Second, otherwise admissible immigrants, particularly refugees, are often unable to pay the required visa fee. Rather than bar them from obtaining a visa, the Secretary is given authority to postpone payment.

Section 16 is also directed to the problem of "insurance" registrations. Many applicants for visas have been offered visas repeatedly but have turned them down. They wish only to preserve their priority in registration for possible future use. To handle such cases, section 203(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended so as to

allow the Secretary of State to terminate the registrations of persons who have previously declined visas. This amendment is also important in connection with a contemplated reregistration of applicants in certain over-subscribed areas designed to ascertain whether registrants have died, emigrated elsewhere, or changed their minds; the Secretary is authorized to terminate the registration of all persons who fail to reregister.

Section 17 amends subsections (a) (1), (a) (4) and (g), as redesignated, of section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to allow the entry of certain mentally afflicted persons. Under present law, no visas may be issued to aliens who are feeble-minded or insane, or have had one or more attacks of insanity, or who are afflicted with a psychopathic personality, epilepsy, or a mental defect. These provisions have created hardships for families seeking admission, where one member, often a child, is retarded. Such families are presented with the difficult decision as to whether they should leave the afflicted person behind or stay with him. Such a person cannot enter the United States even if the family is willing and able to care for him here and even if he is within the 85 percent of mentally afflicted persons whose condition can be substantially improved by adequate treatment.

The amendment gives the Attorney General discretionary authority to admit such persons who are the spouses, children, or parents of citizens or resident aliens, or who are accompanying a member of their family. The Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, would prescribe the controls and conditions on the entry of such persons, including the giving of a bond to insure continued family support.

The bar against the admission of epileptics is removed entirely, since this affliction can effectively be medically controlled. The amendment would also provide that the term "mentally retarded" be substituted for the present term "feeble minded." This is not a substantive change in the law.

Section 18 establishes the Immigration Board, to be composed of seven members. Two Members of the House of Representatives are appointed by the Speaker with the approval of the majority and minority leaders, two Members of the Senate, by the President of the Senate, with the approval of the majority and minority leaders, and three members, including the Chairman, by the President. Members not otherwise in Government service are to be paid on a per diem basis for actual time spent in the work of the Board.

The section provides that the Board's duties shall be to study, and consult with appropriate Government departments on all facets of immigration policy; to make recommendations to the President as to the reservation and allocation of quota numbers, and to recommend to the Attorney General criteria for admission of skilled specialists and workers whose services are needed by reason of labor shortages in this country.

Section 19 grants consular officers discretionary authority to require bonds ensuring that certain nonimmigrants will depart voluntarily from the United States when required. This amendment to section 221(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, by providing an additional safeguard against a later refusal to depart, would allow the issuance of visas in many borderline cases in which visas are now refused to students and visitors.

Section 20 amends section 272 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which imposes a penalty on carriers bringing to the United States aliens afflicted with certain defects, so as to make that section conform

with the changes made by this bill and section 11 of the act of September 26, 1961.

[From the New York Times]

I LIFT MY LAMP

President Johnson's forthright message on immigration reform revives an issue that should trouble the American conscience.

Since 1924 the United States has rigged admission to this country on a racist basis. The Nordic countries of northwestern Europe have large immigration quotas, while the Slavic and Latin countries of eastern and southern Europe have tiny quotas. This is the so-called national origins quota system designed to preserve the racial balance and implicitly the racial purity—then thought to exist in this country. The quota system was one ugly fruit of two generations of propaganda about race in Europe and America.

Sharply improved scholarship in ethnic history and in anthropology in recent decades should have had a chastening effect. But when Congress last confronted this problem, it flunked the test. The McCarran-Walter Immigration Act of 1952, which was passed over President Truman's veto, not only confirmed the racial quota system but introduced fresh anomalies and racist theories into the law.

Thus it is that the United States stands self-condemned before the world for imposing severe restraints on immigration by men and women from Athens and Rome—two of the chief sources of glory and greatness in that Western civilization. Americans share and defend today. The people who produced Plato, Aristotle and Demosthenes are limited to 308 quota numbers a year. The people of Dante and Michelangelo are limited to 5,666. In this fashion the United States solemnly counts and calibrates the potential worth of all mankind. Is there not something terribly arrogant—and also absurd—in this self-righteous national posture?

President Johnson's proposal would eliminate the racial quota system and place admission to this country basically on a first-come, first-admitted basis. It deserves enactment. It is time to rekindle that lamp beside the golden door and banish forever those shadows that have dimmed its bright flame too long.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the President has asked Congress to enact a new immigration law which would basically change American immigration policies. I am very happy to join in sponsoring this bill.

I am heartened that he recognized a compelling need to enact an immigration law that serves the national interest and reflects in every detail the principles of equality and human dignity to which our Nation subscribes.

He has proposed a bill which would eliminate altogether the national origins system for allocating quotas; the Asia Pacific triangle; and other racially discriminatory aspects of our present immigration laws.

The proposed legislation also would establish a series of priorities for admission: first, to immigrants with skills and training needed in our national economy; second, to persons closely related to U.S. citizens and permanent residents; and, third, to all other immigrants on a first-come, first-served basis, with no one nation receiving more than 10 percent of the quota numbers available in any one year.

I am happy to note that the President's proposals would correct two serious defects in our present immigration laws.

First, our present laws often deny admission to immigrants who have outstanding and badly needed skills and talents. The President's proposals would give priority to immigrants who have the kind of skills and talents our economy needs very badly, without affecting our unemployment rates.

Thus, our national economic growth would be enhanced, our economy would be stimulated, and new employment opportunities would be generated.

Second, our present laws often needlessly separate our citizens from their parents or other close relatives. The President's proposals would give preference to close relatives of citizens and permanent residents, and thus serve to promote the reuniting of families.

To insure that the new system would not impose undue hardship on any of our close allies by suddenly curtailing their emigration, the bill authorizes the President, after consultation with an Immigration Board established by the legislation, to utilize up to 30 percent of the quota numbers available in any year for the purpose of restoring cuts made by the new system in the quotas established by existing law.

Similar authority, permitting the reservation of up to 10 percent of the total authorized quota numbers available in any year, would enable us to meet the needs of refugees fleeing from catastrophe or oppression.

In addition, the administration's bill would, first, permit numbers not used by any country to be made available to countries where they are needed; second, eliminate discrimination against newly independent countries of the Western Hemisphere by providing nonquota status for natives of Jamaica, Trinidad, and Tobago; third, afford nonquota status to parents of citizens, and fourth preference to parents of resident aliens; fourth, eliminate the requirement that skilled first preference immigrants needed in our economy must actually find an employer here before they can come to the United States; fifth, afford a preference to workers with lesser skills who can fill specific needs in short supply; and sixth, authorize the Secretary of State to require reregistration of quota immigrant visa applicants and to regulate the time of payment of visa fees.

Under the President's proposal, existing national quotas would be reduced at the rate of 20 percent annually until the allotments were wiped out in 5 years. These quota numbers would go into a reserve pool for redistribution under the system of priorities I mentioned earlier.

The administration's proposal would not change any requirements under existing laws for preventing entry of undesirable persons. Applicants must still satisfy all security requirements we now have, and other requirements designed to exclude persons likely to become public charges.

The measure would only increase by less than 7,000 the total authorized quota immigration annually.

By seeking an immigration policy reflecting America's ideal of the equality of all men without regard to race, color,

creed, or national origin, we would accomplish two purposes:

First. We would enhance America's image as leader of the free world in according equal dignity and respect to all peoples of the world, and thus accomplish a significant forward stride in our international relations.

Second. We would recognize the individual worth of each immigrant and his potential contribution to the development and growth of our national economy.

These basic changes in American immigration policy are long overdue. Revision of our immigration laws is a logical extension of our efforts to achieve our ideal of equality.

Last year we enacted the historic Civil Rights Act of 1964, which was designed to wipe out the last vestiges of racial discrimination against our own citizens.

As we reappraise the relationship of citizen to citizen under this law, it is also good for us to reexamine this same relationship of man's equality to man with respect to peoples of the world.

For as we move to erase racial discrimination against our own citizens, we should also move to erase racial barriers against citizens of other lands in our immigration laws.

I am encouraged that the President has called upon the Congress to accord priority consideration to immigration reform legislation.

I have long regarded this as an issue of fundamental policy. For our present immigration laws disparage our democratic heritage. They directly contradict the spirit and principles of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and our traditional standards of justice, decency, and the dignity and equality of all men.

No legislation could more cogently and with more telling effect reaffirm our fundamental belief in the equality of man.

INCREASE IN MILEAGE OF NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to increase the total mileage of the National System of Interstate Highways from 41,000 miles to 50,000 miles.

The Federal Bureau of Public Roads has requests from numerous States, including New Jersey, for an additional 20,000 miles of highway, over and above the existing authorization. The Bureau cannot consider these because all of the mileage authorized under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 has been allocated.

The growth of our population and the increasing use of motor vehicles make it advisable that the Interstate System be expanded now from its presently authorized 41,000 miles. We cannot wait until 1972 and then begin thinking about adding new highways.

The need is here and now. For example, in New Jersey there is the pressing need for an expressway to link Trenton with the shore area. But as I have al-

TAX CLASSIFICATION OF DEBIT LIFE INSURANCE SALESMEN

(Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, those who are classified as "outside salesmen" are allowed to take as deductions from gross income, the ordinary and necessary expenses of their business activities. What this means, in effect, is that having this status, one may take this form of deduction to reach adjusted gross income and then may take either the standard 10-percent deduction or his itemized deductions to compute his taxable income.

At present, most life insurance salesmen are classified as outside salesmen. One group, however, the so-called debit life insurance salesmen, are not and, because of the similarity in the job and the means of doing it between debit salesmen and other life insurance salesmen, I have today introduced an amendment to section 62(2)(D) of the Internal Revenue Code to equalize treatment of these two groups.

Both of these groups of insurance salesmen must hold the same license for their profession and both sell basically the same lines of insurance. The debit agent, however, sells industrial insurance in addition to the other lines of insurance. These sales involve work away from the employer's place of business and much out-of-pocket expense for the agent. Industrial life insurance is subject to cancellation at will by the insured and the premiums on it are small and fall due weekly or monthly. The agent must collect the premiums and each collection is, in essence, a new sale. These debit agents are salesmen primarily and not collectors and drawing a distinction between them and other insurance agents on the basis of a collateral collection function is unwarranted for purposes of the outside salesmen section of the Internal Revenue Code.

FULL RIGHTS OF CITIZENSHIP FOR AMERICAN DEPENDENCIES

(Mr. BENNETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the 89th Congress, I introduced H.R. 269, a bill to authorize that the Virgin Islands be incorporated in the State of Florida, provided that the incorporation is approved by free elections in the Virgin Islands and in Florida.

My reason for introducing this legislation is that I am apprehensive that pressure upon the United States in the United Nations and other sources may make it difficult for the United States to retain the territory as part of our country. The recent U.N. Committee of 24 Report, dealing with colonialism, was critical of our Nation's control over the Virgin Island territory. The anticolonialism ground swell should not and cannot be overlooked by our country;

and the fact that since 1944 one-third of the world's population has become independent is evidence enough that the trend toward anticolonialism is a definite threat to our retaining our dependencies. This includes not only the Virgin Islands, but American Samoa and Guam as well.

I am very interested that the Virgin Islands and our other dependencies be retained by our Government, and it seems to me that the most logical and feasible future course for the United States to take with regard to the Virgin Islands would be to incorporate them in a state of the United States. Originally, I introduced a bill to allow the Virgin Islanders and the people of Florida to vote on the idea of incorporation in Florida. However, from both the mainland and islands sources there has been a demand for a broader choice. I have introduced a substitute measure today that would allow the Virgin Islanders to vote for a union with any State, and if they favor this, a choice as to what State they might want to be attached to.

In a recent meeting with Gov. Ralph Paiewonsky, of the Virgin Islands, a distinguished representative of the fine Americans living in the islands, he pointed out that another State besides Florida might be considered by some people in the Virgin Islands as better suited to incorporation with the Virgin Islands, and that is the reason for my substitute measure.

It has been brought to my attention that the Virgin Islands Constitutional Convention, now in session in St. Croix, V.I., has presented several suggestions for stronger ties to the mainland United States. However, these suggestions fall short of my proposal which would allow the islanders to vote not only for the President of the United States, but also Senators and Congressmen. My proposal would allow full rights of citizenship on an equal basis with the 180 million Americans living in the 50 States.

The anticolonialism threat imperils the basic interests of the United States in its control over its territories and possessions. A halfway approach to full rights of citizenship cannot be an answer, and the sooner we settle this fully the better it will be for everybody.

The fact of self-government and allowing citizens to vote for President and Representatives in the Congress can be accomplished by my legislation. It would take a constitutional amendment to allow American citizens in a territory to vote even for the President.

Permanent attachment of the Virgin Islands, American Samoa and Guam, with full citizenship rights might also be accomplished by establishment of a separate state combining all of these dependencies, which might also include the District of Columbia.

It is in the national interest to provide full rights of citizenship to these people, and particularly to the Virgin Islanders. The defense and national security value of the territory and its strategic location in the Caribbean area are my principal concerns in the retention of the Virgin Islands as a concrete part of the United

States. The United States bought the Virgin Islands in 1917 from Denmark for defense reasons. We cannot afford to throw that defense value away.

The incorporation would serve as a cultural bridge between North and South America for a greater exchange of ideas and interests, and the tourism industry of the Virgin Islands would be greatly enhanced with a closer tie to the mainland. I know of nothing that the islands now have which would be in any way endangered or diminished by such a union. The Virgin Islands with 35,000 people is about the size of the average Florida County, and it is much too small to be considered for statehood, and this is also true of other U.S. possessions, Guam, with 67,044 people, and American Samoa, with 20,051 people.

In our modern times with rapid transportation, distances such as are involved here are no longer a serious problem. If you look at the much greater distances from the outermost inhabited islands of Hawaii and Alaska compared with the 1,100 miles from Florida to the Virgin Islands you can see that this is nothing very exceptional.

The State Department and the Interior Department are both concerned over the future of our possessions, not only in the light of the anticolonialism threat, but also in the right of all citizens to have full citizenship. In a recent press conference, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall called my idea "a very stimulating one—a provocative one," and that this is one of the ways to solve the problem that the people of the Virgin Islands face in terms of their ultimate political future and sovereignty.

To accomplish my suggestion I have asked the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for early departmental reports and hearings.

We must begin some hard and constructive thinking in this field. I believe my legislation is the most practical and feasible way to grant full rights of citizenship to not only the people of the Virgin Islands, but to all of the people now citizens in all our possessions, territories, and districts.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point newspaper comments:

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune, Jan. 5, 1965]

VIRGIN ISLANDS EYED AS FLORIDA'S 68TH COUNTY

WASHINGTON.—A bill to incorporate the Virgin Islands as Florida's 68th county was introduced yesterday by Representative CHARLES E. BENNETT, Democrat, of Florida.

He called for elections in the Virgin Islands and in Florida for the citizens to express their views.

BENNETT said he has written Ralph M. Paiewonsky, the Governor of the Virgin Islands, requesting that the Virgin Islands constitutional convention, now in session, study his proposal.

The islands were acquired by the United States from Denmark in 1917 because of their defense value and strategic location in the Caribbean.

BENNETT said in a statement that a recent United Nations report criticizing the status of the Virgin Islands as a territory of the United States might bring about pressures

making it difficult for this country to retain its rights to the islands.

CITES DEFENSE VALUE

"Personally, I am delighted that the Virgin Islands are part of the United States, and I believe the islands have a potential defense value in the future which could be greatly accelerated by proper attention and development," BENNETT wrote Palewonsky.

"We must not lose this territory not only because of the importance to national security," BENNETT said, "but because all of the 50 States, not only Florida, have a great deal to gain with the incorporation of the Virgin Islands in the State of Florida."

"The islands as a part of Florida would provide a tangible and specific link between the United States and South America, boosting the cultural connections of the Western Hemisphere, and the tourist industry, so vital to both the islands and to Florida, would be mutually enhanced."

WILL PUSH PLAN

The Virgin Islands constitutional convention is in the process of preparing recommendations to Congress for modifying the organic act of 1954 which set up the government of the islands.

"The basic source of Federal authority in matters of territorial-government is the Congress," BENNETT said, "and I plan to vigorously push the plan of incorporation of the Virgin Islands in the State of Florida. I am certain it would mean a great deal to our national security, the promotion of tourism and the general cultural development between North and South America."

[From the Orlando (Fla.) Evening Star, Jan. 7, 1965]

FLORIDA MAY GET NEW COUNTY

Congressman CHARLES E. BENNETT of Jacksonville has suggested that if the Virgin Islands wish to be annexed to the United States they should be as Florida's 68th county rather than as the Nation's 51st State.

How far the proposal may get is problematical but BENNETT is serious about it. He has already introduced a bill into the new Congress and has written the Governor of the islands to ask his cooperation.

The Virgin Islands are now a territory of the United States but the Communist-fanned outcry against colonialism has resulted in a sharp United Nations criticism of the islands' present status.

The emerging concept that every little dot of territory should become an independent nation fits in perfectly with the Communists' plans to divide and conquer.

It is Congressman BENNETT's hope that the strategic Caribbean islands just east of Puerto Rico may be kept under U.S. control as a national defense measure.

Since the territory is not suitable either by size, economy, or political stability to become a full-fledged member of the United States, BENNETT feels the natural move would be to incorporate it into the nearest sovereign State, Florida.

He has publicly asked Florida citizens to express their feelings in this matter but gives no indication what reaction he may have received from State legislators or the new administration in Tallahassee.

Anyhow, it's an interesting concept. If the Nation can absorb a State thousands of miles out in the middle of the Pacific Ocean perhaps it is not so fantastic for a State to add a county which is a mere 1,500 miles from its nearest shore.

[From the Orlando (Fla.) Sentinel, Jan. 10, 1965]

ISLAND COUNTY

Congressman CHARLES BENNETT has introduced a bill in Congress to incorporate the Virgin Islands as Florida's 68th county, suggesting that people of Florida and the Vir-

gin Islands both vote to express their views.

His reason is that a recent U.N. report criticizing the status of the islands may bring about pressures making it difficult for the United States to retain its rights there.

We don't imagine Floridians would have any objection to adopting a new county, since this would make us one of the most farflung of the States. But as for the islanders, we don't know. They'd have a long trip if they ever wanted to go to the State capital.

TEMPORARY RELEASE OF COPPER FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE

(Mr. ST GERMAIN (at the request of Mr. HANLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months our copper industry has been adversely affected by the short supply of copper. The supply has been steadily dwindling and many industries in my State are dependent upon this metal for the manufacture of their prime products.

The copper economy is most important to the economy of my State of Rhode Island—8,000 employees are affected by this shortage in my State alone—as well as to the country, and I strongly believe that the Federal Government has a responsibility to see that this situation is stabilized.

Today I am introducing a bill which I believe will be helpful in stabilizing the present situation. We do not have adequate supplies of copper, but there is available copper in the national stockpile and this could be made available to domestic users on a loan basis.

Incidentally, since noting the short supply of copper available to the industry of my State, there have been two major breakthroughs during the past 2 months which were extremely helpful. No. 1—some 30,000 tons of copper were released from the Defense Production Act inventory to the Bureau of the Mint. They assisted the private industries, to some extent, since the Mint did not have to draw on supplies already short and available to the industry. No. 2—the Defense Production Act inventory announced that the Federal Government would sell 20,000 tons of copper for domestic consumption.

These two announcements and actions have been of help in alleviating the situation. However, the copper situation, as I have pointed out, is very serious. Relief cannot be given adequately by any administrative means, and I sincerely hope that the Congress will act expeditiously on my bill which will grant the necessary authority to loan 100,000 short tons of copper to our primary producers. Of primary concern to me is to see that when such loans are authorized, they are made on an equitable basis to all copper users. Under this bill, the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning would have the responsibility for making the necessary rules and regulations. There should be a great deal of thought put into the method of distribution. It should be more than a mere distribution on the basis of the amount used per year by the various manufacturers. The regulations should

recognize the fact that many companies in the manufacturing business are also copper producers. For this reason the formula should take the above into consideration so that the firms that are not producing copper will receive equitable amounts in order that their employees may not suffer from the lack of work due to the shortage of copper.

An equitable distribution, taking these factors into consideration, is as important as the release or loan of the copper itself.

As I have stated, I believe that in this instance the Federal Government has the responsibility to promote stability and to assist both the producers and users of copper. Favorable action on this legislation would stabilize the economy and tide over the industry during the necessary period and it would do away with the speculation and trading at exorbitant prices which has made the situation so untenable.

(Mr. DULSKI (at the request of Mr. HANLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. DULSKI'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. DULSKI (at the request of Mr. HANLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. DULSKI'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

AMENDMENT OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

(Mr. CELLER (at the request of Mr. HANLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that I have today introduced the administration bill on immigration. Because a good many Members will follow suit, I offer for the Record a section-by-section analysis of the bill. This section-by-section analysis will prove most helpful for the Members of the House:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1 amends section 201(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, under which quotas for each country are determined. It abolishes the national origins system by reducing present quotas by one-fifth of their present number each year for 5 years. As numbers are released from national origins quotas, they are added to the quota reserve pool established by the amendment to section 201 of the act made by section 3 of the bill. Thus in the first year, 20 percent (roughly 32,000) are released to the pool; in the second year, the pool will have 40 percent of present quotas (or 64,000); until in the fifth year and thereafter, all numbers are allocated through the pool. To provide some immediate relief to minimum quota areas, the minimum quota is raised to 200, but is then reduced in the same manner as other quotas.

Section 2 amends section 201(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act by chang-

1965

ing a reference therein from "section 202 (e)" to "section 202(d)" in conformity with the redesignation of section 202(e) as 202(d) made by section 6(e) of the bill.

Section 3 amends section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act by adding a new subsection (f). This subsection establishes the quota reserve pool from which all quota numbers will be allocated by the 5th year. In each of the 5 years constituting the period of transition, the pool will consist of (1) the numbers released from national origins quotas each year, and (2) numbers assigned to the old quota areas but unused the previous year because insufficient demand for them existed in the assigned quota area.

Quota numbers are issued in the order of preference specified in amended section 203 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (see Sec. 10 of the bill). That is, first call on the first 50 percent is given to persons whose admission, by virtue of their exceptional skill, training or education, will be especially advantageous to the United States; first call on the next 30 percent, plus any part of the first 50 percent not issued for first preference purposes, is given to unmarried sons and daughters of U.S. citizens, not eligible for non-quota status because they are over 21 years of age; first call on the remaining 20 percent, plus any part of the first 80 percent not taken by the first two preference classes, is given to spouses and unmarried sons or daughters of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence; and any portion remaining is issued to other quota visa applicants, with percentage preferences to other relatives of U.S. citizens and resident aliens, and then to certain classes of workers. Amended section 203 further provides that within each class, visas are issued in the order in which applied for—first come, first served. These preference provisions, which under present law determine only relative priority between Nationals of the same country, will now determine priority between nationals of different countries throughout the world.

To prevent disproportionate benefits to the nationals of any single country, a maximum of 10 percent of the total authorized quota is set on immigration attributable to any quota area. However, this limitation is not applied if to do so would result in reducing any quota at a more rapid rate than that provided by amended section 201(a). Ultimately, of course, the limitation applies to all.

Exceptions to the principle of allocating visas on the basis of time of registration within preference classes are provided to deal with special problems. Since some countries' quotas are not current, their nationals have no old registrations on file. To apply the principle rigidly would result, after 4 or 5 years, in curtailing immigration from these countries almost entirely. This would be undesirable not only because it would frustrate the aim of the bill that immigration from all countries should continue, but also because many of the countries that would be affected are our closest allies. Therefore, proposed section 201(f) would authorize the President, after consultation with the Immigration Board (established by section 18), to reserve up to 30 percent of the quota reserve pool for allocation to qualified immigrants (1) who could obtain visas under the existing system but not under the new system and (2) whose admission to the United States would further the national security interest by maintaining close ties with their countries. The number of quota visas so allocated may exceed the 10-percent limit on the number of immigrants from any country in the case of those countries which, under the existing system, regularly receive allocations in excess of that limit.

Subsection (f) also allows the President to reserve up to 10 percent of the quota reserve pool for allocation to certain refugees and

permits him to disregard priority of registration within preference classes for the benefit of such refugees. Many refugees, almost by definition, are uprooted suddenly. They had no thought of immigration until they were forced to leave the country in which they were living because of natural calamity or political upheaval; or they may be refugees from persecution or dictatorship, in which case previous registration would have been dangerous.

Finally, subsection (f) provides that if the President reserves, against contingencies, any numbers during the year, but thereafter finds them not to be needed for the named purposes, such numbers are to be issued as if they had not been reserved. Similarly, the 10-percent limitation on the number of visas to be issued to any quota area is made inoperable if its application would result in authorized quota numbers not being used.

Section 4 amends section 201(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which presently limits the number of quota visas issued in any single month to 10 percent of the total yearly quota. This limitation is needed to insure that persons entitled to preference by virtue of special skills or family ties will not be foreclosed from preference by a rush of earlier applications which exhaust the annual quota. To insure that all available quota numbers can nevertheless be utilized, present law provides that numbers not used during the first 10 months of any fiscal year may be used during the last 2 months of such year, without regard to the 10-percent monthly limitation. Often, if close to the full 10 percent of quota visas is not issued in each of the first months of the year, undesirable administrative problems result in the last 2. The amendment allows the issuance each month of the 10 percent authorized for that month plus any visas authorized but not issued in previous months. This permits a more even spacing of visa issuance during the year.

Section 5 amends section 201(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act which now permits the issuance of quota immigrant visas to nonquota immigrants. Substituted for the provisions of section 201(d) is a specific direction that no quota immigrant visa shall be issued to a person who is eligible for a nonquota immigrant visa. This will prevent nonquota immigrants from preempting visas to the prejudice of qualified quota immigrants.

Section 6 amends section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the so-called "Asia-Pacific Triangle" provisions, which require persons of Asian stock to be attributed to quota areas not by their place of birth, but according to their racial ancestry. At the end of the 5-year transition period, this provision would be in any event superfluous, since national origin will no longer be a standard for the admission of qualified quota immigrants. But the formula is so especially discriminatory that it should be removed immediately, and not be permitted to operate even in part during the 5-year transition period.

Subsection (c) of the section amends section 202(c) of the act so as to raise the minimum allotment to subquotas of dependent areas of a governing country, thus preserving their present equality with independent minimum-quota areas. The dependent area's allotment is taken from the governing country's quota. To prevent a dependent area from preempting the governing country's quota disproportionately, it is provided that the dependent area's share of the quota will decrease as the governing country's quota is reduced.

Section 7 amends section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act by deleting the language of that section which prevents the issuance of visas in lieu of those issued but not actually used, or later found to be improperly issued. Thus in Germany

alone over 7,000 quota visas are now taken by persons entitled to nonquota status, and 2,000 more quota visas are issued to persons who do not actually apply for admission to the United States. All these quota visas are lost under the present law. Such a result is inconsistent with the aim of the bill that all authorized quota numbers shall be used. The amended section 207 specifically authorizes the issuance of a quota visa in lieu of one improperly issued or not actually used, utilizing the same quota number.

Section 8 amends section 101(a)(27)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which grants nonquota status to spouses and children of U.S. citizens, so as to extend non-quota status to parents of U.S. citizens as well.

Section 9 amends section 101(a)(27)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to extend nonquota status to natives of all independent Western Hemisphere countries. Under present law, such status is granted to natives of all independent North, Central, and South American countries, and of named Caribbean island countries which were independent when the Immigration and Nationality Act was enacted in 1952. The amendment extends nonquota status to natives of countries in these areas which have gained their independence since then, or may gain their independence hereafter.

Section 10 amends section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which establishes preferences for immigrants with special skills and for relatives of U.S. citizens and resident aliens.

Subsection (a) relaxes the test for the first preference accorded to persons of high education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability. Under present law, such persons are granted preferred status only if the Attorney General determines that their services are "needed urgently" in the United States. The amendment allows them first preference if their services, as determined by the Attorney General, would be "especially advantageous" to the United States.

Subsection (b) eliminates the second preference for parents of American citizens, now accorded nonquota status by the amendment made by section 8 of the bill.

Subsection (c) grants a fourth preference, up to 50 percent of numbers not issued to the first three preferences, to parents of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence. It also grants a subsidiary preference to qualified quota immigrants capable of filling particular labor shortages in the United States. Under present law, immigrants who do not meet the rigorous standards of the skilled specialist category are not preferred over any other immigrants even though they can fill a definite labor need which other immigrants cannot fill. The amendment allows to such immigrants a preference of 50 percent of the quota visas remaining after all family preferences have been satisfied or exhausted.

Section 11 amends section 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which establishes the procedure for determining eligibility for preferred status under section 203.

The amendments made by paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) cover the filing of petitions, on behalf of the workers accorded a fourth preference, by the persons who will employ them to fill the special labor needs. Paragraph (1) provides for approval of these petitions by the Attorney General, and paragraph (2) requires that he consult with the Immigration Board and interested departments of Government before granting preference to these workers.

Paragraph (2) also exempts first preference skilled specialists from the present petition procedure because under the bill a new procedure is established for such persons. Under present law, skilled specialists may

qualify for preferred status only when a petition requesting their services is filed by a U.S. employer. This requirement unduly restricts our ability to attract those whose services would substantially enhance our economy, cultural interests, and welfare. Many of these people have no way of contacting employers in the United States in order to obtain the required employment. Even if they knew whom to contact, few openings important enough to attract such highly-skilled people are offered without personal interviews, and only a few very large enterprises or institutions have representatives abroad with hiring authority. Thus many such skilled specialists cannot obtain the employment presently required for first preference status.

Moreover, the requirement of prearranged employment is in fact unnecessary. Highly skilled specialists would obviously work at their specialty, provided that employment is open. The only check needed is that the Attorney General ascertain, upon consultation with appropriate Government agencies, that job openings exist in the specialist's particular field. Although the present petition procedure serves to confirm the individual's own evidence of his training, education, or skills, such confirmation is not essential if proper investigation is made of his qualifications before the preference is accorded.

Paragraph (5), therefore, allows the Attorney General to grant a first preference to skilled specialists upon their own petitions, supported by such documentation as the Attorney General shall require. In this connection it is to be noted that the existing law requiring an investigation by the Attorney General of the petitioner's qualifications and a determination of his eligibility for a first preference is continued.

Section 12 amends section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, providing for petitions to establish eligibility for preference as a relative of a U.S. citizen or lawfully resident alien, to conform to the substantive amendments made by section 10.

Section 13 amends the "fair share" refugee law so as to remove a provision which has hampered its effective operation. Presently, the entry of refugees is subject to the condition that they be within the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. The mandate provision is eliminated, so that the refugee law will no longer be subject to outside control. In addition, subsection (b) enlarges the applicable area definition so as to allow the entry of refugees from North Africa generally, and Algeria particularly, who are unable to return to their countries because of their race, religion, or political opinions, and incorporates this new definition in the "fair share" law. The existing definition encompasses refugees from any country within the general area of the Middle East, which is defined as the area between Libya on the west, Turkey on the north, Pakistan on the east, and Saudi Arabia and Ethiopia on the south. The new definition substitutes Morocco for Libya as the western border of this area.

Section 14 repeals the "fair share" law's special provision for 500 "difficult to resettle" refugees; all such persons have been taken care of, and the authority is therefore no longer necessary.

Section 15 amends section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to grant discretionary authority to the Secretary of State to specify the time and manner of payment of the fees for visa applications and issuances. This discretionary authority will allow the Secretary to control two undesirable situations:

First, many people in countries with over-subscribed quotas register their names on visa waiting lists even though they have no present intention of emigrating; they regard the registration as insurance for possible

future use. Such registrations have the effect of creating a distorted picture of visa backlogs and make efficient administration difficult. The amendment therefore would allow the Secretary of State to require a registrant to deposit a fee at the time of registration. While not unduly burdensome on those who wish to come here, such a procedure would serve to discourage registrations which are not bona fide.

Second, otherwise admissible immigrants, particularly refugees, are often unable to pay the required visa fee. Rather than bar them from obtaining a visa, the Secretary is given authority to postpone payment.

Section 16 is also directed to the problem of "insurance" registrations. Many applicants for visas have been offered visas repeatedly but have turned them down. They wish only to preserve their priority in registration for possible future use. To handle such cases, section 203(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended so as to allow the Secretary of State to terminate the registrations of persons who have previously declined visas. This amendment is also important in connection with a contemplated reregistration of applicants in certain over-subscribed quota areas designed to ascertain whether registrants have died, emigrated elsewhere, or changed their minds; the Secretary is authorized to terminate the registration of all persons who fail to reregister.

Section 17 amends subsections (a) (1), (a) (4), and (g), as redesignated, of section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to allow the entry of certain mentally afflicted persons. Under present law, no visas may be issued to aliens who are feeble-minded or insane, or have had one or more attacks of insanity, or who are afflicted with a psychopathic personality, epilepsy, or a mental defect. These provisions have created hardships for families seeking admission, where one member, often a child, is retarded. Such families are presented with the difficult decision as to whether they should leave the afflicted person behind or stay with him. Such a person cannot enter the United States even if the family is willing and able to care for him here and even if he is within the 85 percent of mentally afflicted persons whose condition can be substantially improved by adequate treatment.

The amendment gives the Attorney General discretionary authority to admit such persons who are the spouses, children, or parents of citizens or resident aliens, or who are accompanying a member of their family. The Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, would prescribe the controls and conditions on the entry of such persons, including the giving of a bond to insure continued family support.

The bar against the admission of epileptics is removed entirely, since this affliction can effectively be medically controlled. The amendment would also provide that the term "mentally retarded" be substituted for the present term "feeble-minded." This is not a substantive change in the law.

Section 18 establishes the Immigration Board, to be composed of seven members. Two members of the House of Representatives are appointed by the Speaker with the approval of the majority and minority leaders, two members of the Senate, by the President of the Senate, with the approval of the majority and minority leaders, and three members, including the Chairman, by the President. Members not otherwise in government service are to be paid on a per diem basis for actual time spent in the work of the Board.

The section provides that the Board's duties shall be to study, and consult with appropriate government departments on all facets of immigration policy; to make recommendations to the President as to the reservation and allocation of quota numbers,

and to recommend to the Attorney General criteria for admission of skilled specialists and workers whose services are needed by reason of labor shortages in this country.

Section 19 grants consular officers discretionary authority to require bonds ensuring that certain nonimmigrants will depart voluntarily from the United States when required. This amendment to section 221(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, by providing an additional safeguard against a later refusal to depart, would allow the issuance of visas in many borderline cases in which visas are now refused to students and visitors.

Section 20 amends section 272 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which imposes a penalty on carriers bringing to the United States aliens afflicted with certain defects, so as to make that section conform with the changes made by this bill and section 11 of the act of September 26, 1961.

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. HANLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. HANLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

KENNEDY FILM SHOULD BE RELEASED

(Mr. GIBBONS (at the request of Mr. HANLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a House concurrent resolution, which would make possible the distribution and viewing of the film "John F. Kennedy: Years of Lightning, Day of Drums." Present regulations deny the people of the United States the opportunity to see this film, which has been widely acclaimed by the critics who have seen it.

The citizens of this Nation will not be able to view this unforgettable film unless the Congress takes special action to release it in the United States. It depicts the Kennedy presidency in six major fields and represents the highest type of cinematic creativity. It is my profound belief that the people of this Nation should not be denied the opportunity to see this film.

Produced with great insight for the U.S. Information Agency by Mr. George Stevens, Jr., it has been called "a fittingly affirmative film" by Mr. Richard Coe, drama critic of the Washington Post. Further, Mr. Coe has written, and I quote:

The masterfully imaginative hour-and-a-half documentary is the first full-length feature and by all odds the finest film I've seen by the U.S. Information Agency * * *. This country's taxpayers cannot see it but during the past week it has started its rounds, in

obedience—a liberty that is saving because it is obedient, an obedience that saves because it is free.

The Big Scare Versus the Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that all Americans have a large stake in the outcome of the coming national election. But, because of the tremendous impact on agriculture by activities of the Federal Government, the American farmer has a particularly high stake. Since a concerted campaign of misinformation on Republican farm proposals is being conducted, I am inserting an editorial from the Farm Journal, a renown farm publication, which sets the record straight. I urge all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but particularly the farmers of America, to give this article their attention.

The article follows:

THE BIG SCARE VERSUS THE ISSUES

In this election campaign Farm Journal has hewed to its policy of giving both sides equal treatment in our news columns and has stated its own position only on this page. We believe any publication worth its salt has an obligation to the public to do both things.

Our own position may not be yours. Every man to his own opinion. We have never claimed to be speaking for "all farmers." They don't delegate anybody to do that, thank goodness. Nor do they agree among themselves.

In this concluding statement on the election we'd like to repeat something we said 2 months ago:

"We will be choosing between two men. But more importantly we will be choosing between what they champion. We may or may not like everything about the man we vote for. We may or may not agree with everything he says. But which man represents more clearly the basic direction we want this country to go? That is the big question. Let's never lose sight of it."

Will we lose sight of it in the face of the greatest character smear in modern times? Mr. GOLDWATER is being grossly libeled, his position falsified.

In 1960 Mr. Kennedy frightened the wits out of a good many people with claims about a "missile gap," which supposedly had us in danger of being obliterated by a Russian atom bomb at any moment. It turned out (after election) to be phony. The scares of this year are, in our opinion, just as phony.

Both candidates want peace; who doesn't? Both are responsible. Neither favors annihilation. Both have been in a war, Mr. GOLDWATER in southeast Asia. He has two sons of military age now.

Both candidates have compassion for the poor and have proved it in private life. Their only difference is in how to tackle the problem.

Both want good times to continue. Don't we all? But what best assures them? Control by Government or control by citizens of their own affairs?

We agree with Mr. GOLDWATER that the way to the "great society" is not through the wel-

fare state, toward which we are headed, but through individual enterprise left free to operate. Most of us agree that those who can't take care of themselves must be taken care of, with compassion. But this administration makes more people dependent on Government for a part of their livelihood every day. It steadily usurps more of the functions of private business. It steadily reaches for more power, a little more today, a little more tomorrow. It seems to believe that an all-wise centrally controlled Government in Washington can solve our problems better than we can.

We agree with Mr. GOLDWATER, too, in choosing principle over expediency. For us the attitude of the Johnson administration is too much "peace at any price" with any substantial group of voters at home or any Government abroad, Cuba included.

On farm policy we agree in general with Mr. GOLDWATER's position, and we believe most farmers will if they understand it. He is not for abolishing the farm program and you along with it, as Mr. Johnson and Mr. HUMPHREY have been proclaiming. True, he has been against compulsory Government controls, high rigid support prices, CCC dumping of grains to depress grain prices and club farmers into Government programs, and making the Secretary of Agriculture all powerful. Most farmers feel the same way.

But he is for voluntary programs, for support price at stabilization levels, for a land retirement program, for adequate farm credit, for co-ops.

We agree with the Republican position on reapportioning legislative districts. Mr. GOLDWATER wants to protect the rural minority. The Democrats are courting the big cities. You'll note that Mr. Johnson ducked the question in Farm Journal last month.

Will farmers fall for the phony scares about Mr. GOLDWATER, or will they keep their eye on these big issues? On that the outcome of the election, at least in the farm country, will largely depend.

Hon. James C. Auchincloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, I want personally to express my regrets at the departure from the House of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, ranking minority member of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Congressman AUCHINCLOSS has been a most conscientious member of the committee, and I shall be ever grateful for his cooperation, his devotion and service to the committee, and for the assistance he personally gave to me as chairman on so many occasions during the time he was a member of the committee.

He is a gentleman of deep and earnest convictions and through the years sponsored and supported much legislation which he deemed necessary and important to his Third District of New Jersey, to his State, to the Nation's Capital and to the country at large. They all have benefited greatly from his labors, and he will be sincerely missed by us all.

May he continue to receive deserving rewards in the golden years which lie ahead of him.

A Short Report on Immigration Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, as we near the closing hour of this 88th Congress, I desire to make a short report on the status and progress of pending immigration legislation.

Our Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality began public hearings on pending bills on June 11, 1964. As chairman, I took that action only after it became certain that adequate funds would not be provided to activate the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy during this session. Over the course of 1 year, covering both sessions of this Congress, I sought by every proper means to secure funds to activate the joint committee. It was my conviction that Congress could not act intelligently on pending immigration legislation without a full scale uninhibited and objective review of all the factors, domestic and international, upon which a sound immigration policy must be based. To expect Congress to act without such a review, incidentally a long overdue review, was to call upon Congress to act in the dark, without the facts upon which sound policy rests.

Our subcommittee has provided an opportunity for all interested in our immigration program to appear as witnesses or to present statements for inclusion in the record of our hearings. Orderly and purposeful procedure was employed in the course of our hearings. We opened phase I of our hearings with testimony from interested Members of Congress. Phase II took up testimony from the executive branch of Government including the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Labor, the operating level of the Department of Justice which includes the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the operating level of the Department of State—the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs. Phase III took up testimony from nongovernmental organizations and interested individuals.

This task required hearings, both public and executive, over a course of more than 3 months. Those hearings have been completed and all the reports thereon should be available to Members, the press, and the public in the very near future. Separate reports are being made for each of the three phases of our hearings.

When the hearings had been underway for 2 months, when we had completed testimony from interested Members of Congress and the executive branch and had commenced taking testimony from nongovernmental organizations, I in-

roduced H.R. 12305 on August 10. I did so because it was then apparent that H.R. 7700, the administration bill, could not be enacted into law and the revisions required to make it acceptable would be so basic and far reaching as to alter the original proposal as to make it unrecognizable. In these circumstances I presented a bill which sought to accomplish these purposes:

First. To use the authorized but unused quota numbers over a trial period of 2 years under a new system which conformed to Supreme Court decisions on the responsibility of Congress to regulate immigration into the United States.

Second. To use the unused quota numbers to reunite families, to bring in skilled workers needed to expand our economy without displacing an American worker and to provide a haven for our fair share of the victims of Communist tyranny under conditions which does not attach the stigma of parole to their admission.

Third. To provide an opportunity for Congress to benefit from the practical results of this 2-year trial period while Congress through the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy would undertake and complete the long overdue review of immigration policy.

Fourth. To remedy the most urgent, the most human problems of our present immigration program while Congress was making a determination on what our new immigration policy should be.

The provisions of the bill which I introduced were supported overwhelmingly by the testimony taken up to the time of its introduction. I was encouraged by the rapid and affirmative responses which I received to the action I had taken.

Witnesses appearing during our hearings after August 12 were invited to comment on the provisions and purposes of H.R. 12305. A large number of national organizations rallied their support behind my bill. Our colleague, Congressman EDWARD DERWINSKI, of Illinois, introduced an identical bill on September 4, 1964. In his explanatory remarks he called for bipartisan support and action during this session of Congress, noting that the Republican Party supported the bill which he had introduced.

H.R. 12305 was given full and careful consideration by members of the House Committee on Immigration and Nationality. One major revision of the bill was agreed to, a revision of the definition of a refugee. I was encouraged by the members of my subcommittee, at least a majority thereof, to believe that they would support enactment of that bill.

Over a period of no less than 3 weeks I sought to get a quorum of the subcommittee to take final action on H.R. 12305. Meeting dates and times convenient to the members were set. But a quorum did not result. I then notified each member by telegram on two separate occasions that a meeting was set to vote up or down on H.R. 12305. But again a quorum did not result.

I was somewhat amazed to learn that during that critical period a quorum of the subcommittee was met with Mr. EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the Ju-

diciary Committee, to discuss staff personnel—a matter on which I will have more to say at a later date. It is worth noting in this connection that the gentleman from New York, Congressman CELLER, stated to me more than 1 month ago that there would be no immigration legislation this year. It now appears that his purposes as stated to me have been realized.

During the last 2 days of this Congress, I nevertheless continued my efforts to secure a majority vote on H.R. 12305. Here I was confronted with a new problem. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] had departed Washington and had left word that he would not authorize a poll of the full membership of the Judiciary Committee.

Those are the basic facts related to pending immigration legislation and the 3 months of hearings thereon by the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality. That record speaks for itself.

The 88th Congress: A Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the 88th Congress was a busy, and in many ways productive, Congress. I know that the people I represent want to learn about the activities of Congress during these last 2 years; therefore, I have made this the subject of an October newsletter to my district, the Second Congressional District of Washington State. I think my newsletter will be of interest to Members of Congress as well and therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that it be inserted at this point in the RECORD:

THE 88TH CONGRESS REVIEWED

The 88th Congress—one of the longest and busiest on record—is now history. When the Speaker's gavel adjourned the House of Representatives October 3, the Congress had been in session nearly 321 days. During that time, more than 12,000 public and private measures were introduced; some 820 were finally enacted into law.

The 88th Congress marked some important, though controversial, "firsts." It passed a comprehensive civil rights bill, and approved tax cut legislation providing for an \$11.5 billion reduction in Federal income and corporation taxes. In the Senate, lawmakers ratified the limited nuclear test ban treaty, the first agreement of its kind to result from the cold war. Whatever one's personal feelings, it can at least be said that the 88th Congress made history by dealing with these matters.

Striking closer to home were three bills of particular importance to the Pacific Northwest. Regional power preference legislation was enacted into law, guaranteeing that hydroelectric power produced in the Northwest will be used first to meet the private and industrial needs of the Northwestern United States. After nearly 6 years of work to satisfy all interests, Congress also enacted a "wilderness" bill giving the first statutory protection to some 9 million acres of "wilderness" area. The land and water conservation

bill was approved, enabling the Federal Government to aid the States in the needed development of recreational facilities. Because of my membership on the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I was able to play a major part in the writing and passage of these bills.

Important military construction and public works projects for the second district also resulted from legislation passed by the 88th Congress. Public works funds totaling \$2,163,000 for fiscal 1964 and 1965 cleared the way for further improvement to the Snohomish, Stillaguamish, Skagit, and Nooksack Rivers. Small boat harbors at Port Townsend and Quilcene received additional benefit from public works appropriations. Funds totaling \$693,000 for military construction were passed to bring major improvements to Faine Field and the Blaine Air Force station during fiscal 1964; another \$469,000, appropriated for fiscal 1965, will build a needed aircraft holding apron and new telephone exchange at the Whidbey Island Naval Air Station.

There were, however, some disappointments, including the failure of the administration to act on my bill, H.R. 7961, legislation I introduced to help Northwest mills meet Canadian competition by permitting the shipment of American lumber in foreign-bottom vessels when U.S.-flag ships are unavailable. I believed this bill could be of real benefit to the local economy, but the administration failed to act, and even vetoed the one bill passed by Congress that might have granted some small relief. This was the lumber-marking bill, approved by the first session of the 88th Congress, but vetoed by the President. Beef import legislation was finally approved—despite opposition from the administration—but my bill to provide similar protection for the Northwest dairy industry, remains unpassed.

Of great disappointment for the Nation's older citizens, certainly, was the "death" of the 5 percent social security increase. I voted for this increase in the House, because it was obvious to me that the inflationary policies of this administration made some cost-of-living increase necessary. What happened is now history. The bill passed the House with virtually no opposition, but was blocked in the Senate by Democrats who insisted on adding a compulsory "medicare" amendment. A squabble within the Democrat party erupted, and the Democrats, unable to agree among themselves, chose to kill the 5-percent increase. Given the choice of a bill or an issue, the administration took the issue.

The Nation's veterans were more fortunate. Though the President declared the bill would be "inconsistent with the objectives" of his administration, the Congress passed H.R. 1927, providing pension increases to a half million veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean war. Additional payments for helpless and blind veterans requiring the regular aid of another person, also were increased. Though less comprehensive than some would have liked, H.R. 1927 marked the first major veterans' pension legislation in over 5 years. This bill, incidentally, passed the House without a single dissenting vote, and I joined others in the Congress in voting for this legislation. Similarly, I supported pay increases for the Nation's uniformed servicemen and for 1.7 million civil service workers and postal employees.

Bills to expand vocational education, to provide Federal aid for the fight against mental illness and retardation, to extend "impacted" areas Federal school aid under Public Laws 874 and 815, to provide increased Federal housing and to expand college construction passed the 88th Congress and, likewise, had my support. These were forward steps on the domestic front.

"(6) provide for the support of existing local development districts and encourage the formation of such districts where needed by providing technical assistance and assistance in the financing of a professional staff and administration;

"(7) provide for the encouragement of private investment in industrial, commercial, and recreational projects;

"(8) provide a forum for consideration of problems of the region and proposed solutions and provide for the establishment and utilization, as appropriate, of citizens and other special advisory councils and public conferences;

"(9) provide for the formulation and recommendation to the Congress of a program of development projects with proposals for Federal participation in their funding; and

"(10) provide that all such activities will be carried out by or through a single agency which will serve as a focal point and coordinating unit for Federal, State, and local programs in the region.

"(b) As a condition to making any grant pursuant to this chapter, the Administrator may require the making of such reports, in such form and containing such information, as he determines necessary to carry out his functions under this chapter. He may also require the keeping of such records and the affording of such access thereto as is necessary to verify such reports.

"(c) No grants pursuant to this chapter shall be made for the development of a plan for any one region in excess of a total of \$2,500,000.

"General Authority

"Sec. 506. Any department or agency assigned the development of a Federal-regional action plan pursuant to this chapter may for the purpose of such development—

"(1) arrange for the services of personnel from any State or local government or any subdivision or agency thereof, or any intergovernmental agency, and pay for the same; and

"(2) enter into and perform such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions as may be necessary in carrying out its functions and on such terms as it may deem appropriate, with any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States or with any State, or any political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality thereof, or with any person, firm, association, or corporation.

"Federal Personnel Assistance

"Sec. 507. At the request of any department or agency developing a plan pursuant to this chapter, the head of any other department or agency may detail to temporary duty, on a reimbursable basis, with such agency such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as such agency may need in developing such plan. Such temporary duty shall be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status.

"Report

"Sec. 508. Not later than six months after the completion of any Federal-Regional Action Plan pursuant to section 505, the department or agency developing such plan shall prepare and submit to the Governor of each State in such region and to the President, for transmittal to the Congress, a report on such plan.

"Consent of States

"Sec. 509. Nothing contained in this chapter shall be interpreted as requiring any State to engage in or accept any program under this chapter without its consent.

"Appropriations Authorized

"Sec. 510. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$10,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this chapter."

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS, ETC., OF OBSCENE LITERATURE BILL

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am happy to welcome as cosponsors of S. 309, the obscene literature bill, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG]. I ask unanimous consent that their names be added to the bill as cosponsors, and that on the next printing of the bill their names may be shown as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 289 the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] be added as a cosponsor.

I am delighted to be working shoulder to shoulder with him on this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] be added as a cosponsor of S. 110, to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Public Works Acceleration Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be joined as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 20 at its next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]; the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]; the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]; the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]; the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]; the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern]; the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE]; the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]; the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG]; the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]; the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS]; the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]; the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS]; the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]; the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]; the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]; the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]; the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]; and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], be added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 30, a resolution to give the Select Committee on Small Business the authority to have bills and resolutions referred to it, and to report legislation for consideration on the floor of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and joint resolution:

Authority of January 6, 1965:

S. 3. A bill to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in development of the Appalachian region: Mr. GORE, Mr. MONDALE, and Mr. YARBOROUGH.

S. 5. A bill to provide assistance for students in higher education by establishing programs for student grants, loan insurance, and work-study: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. INOUE, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PELL, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota.

S. 110. A bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Public Works Acceleration Act: Mr. YARBOROUGH.

S. 201. A bill to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year: Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio.

S. 252. A bill to provide for appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second- and third-class post offices: Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CASE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. TOWER, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio.

S. 293. A bill to authorize the establishment of a public community college and a public college of arts and sciences in the District of Columbia: Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio.

S.J. Res. 6. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office: Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. MONDALE.

Authority of January 7, 1965:

S. 310. A bill to amend the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 to authorize the National Council on the Arts to accept and receive bequests, gifts, and donations for use in carrying out the purposes of such act, and to establish the National Arts Foundation: Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. YARBOROUGH.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON THE NOMINATION OF ARTHUR M. OKUN TO BE A MEMBER OF THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold hearings on the nomination of Arthur M. Okun, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers. The hearing is scheduled to be held on Tuesday, January 26, 1965, in room 5302, New Senate Office Building, at 10 a.m.

Any persons who wish to appear and testify in connection with this nomination

January 19

tion are requested to notify Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, telephone 225-3921.

Full file

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION LEGISLATION

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, as chairman of the Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to announce the beginning of hearings on general immigration and naturalization legislation, particularly S. 500, Monday, February 8, 1965, at 10:30 a.m. in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

Prospective witnesses desiring to be heard should contact the Immigration Subcommittee, room 2306, New Senate Office Building, so that a schedule may be arranged.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Statement by him on the retirement of Frank H. Fuller, of the Associated Press.

Letter on commercial bank term loans abroad, received by him from Walter B. Wriston, executive vice president of the First National City Bank of New York.

By Mr. THURMOND:

Editorial entitled "Freedom Is Slipping," published in the Spartanburg Guide and the Textile Tribune of January 14, 1965.

Editorial comment in support of State right-to-work laws.

Editorial, by the Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co., on the proposed abolition of the Army Reserve program.

Editorial entitled, "The Future That Nobody Knows?" from the U.S. News & World Report of January 11, 1965.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

"Words That Live," a booklet published by Eastern Air Lines commemorating tomorrow's inaugural address by President Lyndon B. Johnson.

By Mr. AIKEN:

Article entitled "Our Opinion—Federal Savings Should Consider Welfare of Smaller Communities," published in the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune on January 14, 1965.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

Debate between Senator Morse and Henry Cabot Lodge on U.S. policy on Vietnam, published in the New York Times Magazine on January 17, 1965.

TWO UNIQUE CALIFORNIA CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE INAUGURAL PARADE: SANTA BARBARA "BARBARETTES" AND DOS PALOS HIGH SCHOOL BAND

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the spectacle presented every 4 years when an impressive parade climaxes the swearing in of a new President of the United States allows watchers across the land the chance to see a unique array of marching units, colorful floats, dignitaries, mounted riders, well-drilled mili-

tary groups, and other awe-inspiring features.

To appear in this procession is a coveted honor. Especially this year, when efforts are made to keep the length of the parade within tolerable limits, an opportunity to take part is most cherished.

California, now the Nation's largest State in population, of course has innumerable units well qualified to represent her in this event. The marchers from the Golden State tomorrow celebrating President Johnson's inauguration will be an accomplished high school band from a typical small farming area town and a striking organization from a much larger municipality which has gained nationwide attention and prominence in less than a decade.

California's contribution to the color of the spectacle and entertainment of watchers will be the Santa Barbara "Barbarettes," a novelty drill team of 17 girls and 2 boys, and the Dos Palos High School Band.

Those viewing the procession in person or over television will be rewarded by the performance of the "Barbarettes," of which Jean Robbins is director, that has been featured at such a variety of events as the East-West Shrine football game, the Washington Redskins-Los Angeles Rams football game, the Las Vegas "Hell Dorado Days" and Santa Barbara "Old Spanish Days" parades, Salinas Rodeo, and a host of civic celebrations in California and neighboring States. This aggregation's precision and distinctiveness has brought it over 100 trophies and an equal number of blue ribbons in assorted competitions.

The Dos Palos High School Band is equally distinguished. Representing a community of only some 2,000 souls in the agricultural region of California's rich San Joaquin Valley, this musical group has gained fame in statewide competition. The justified civic pride in its achievements and competence prompted residents of the town to raise funds to meet expenses of sending the band to the National Capital for this occasion.

California is proud, indeed, to be represented by the Santa Barbara "Barbarettes" and the Dos Palos High School Band.

REAUTHORIZATION OF GARRISON DIVERSION IRRIGATION PROJECT, NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the Pick-Sloan plan for development of the Missouri River Basin was authorized under the Flood Control Act of 1944. Much of this great program has already become a reality.

It includes five very large multiple purpose dams on the Missouri River. The people of the Missouri Basin have already realized untold benefits from these huge dams, including protection against the devastating floods of the past.

In making possible these vast reservoirs to store flood waters, it was necessary to acquire a large amount of very fertile land. North Dakota alone lost over 550,000 acres of its most valuable

agricultural lands for the Garrison and Oahe Dams.

Under the Flood Control Act of 1944 one of the major commitments was to replace this lost acreage with irrigated land. The Flood Control Act of 1944 specifically authorized a large irrigation project for North Dakota.

Because of the long delay on the part of the Federal Government in embarking upon the irrigation phase of the Pick-Sloan plan, it is felt by many that the Garrison diversion irrigation project in North Dakota should be reauthorized.

The project for which we are seeking reauthorization would irrigate only about 250,000 acres as against approximately 1 million acres authorized under the Flood Control Act of 1944.

Mr. President, the Garrison diversion irrigation project, besides providing this most necessary irrigation, would also greatly enhance the fish and wildlife interests not only in North Dakota but the entire Nation. Too, it would provide badly needed and necessary water supplies to at least four of our larger cities.

Mr. President, the entire State of North Dakota is united in support of this project. The original authorization was endorsed by President Harry S. Truman when he signed the Flood Control Act of 1944 of which it was a part. The reauthorization, which we are now seeking, was endorsed by Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, and Lyndon B. Johnson.

I am pleased to offer for the RECORD House Concurrent Resolution A, just approved unanimously by the State Legislature of North Dakota.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution ordered to be printed in the RECORD is as follows:
HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION "A": GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT

Whereas a substantial irrigation development for North Dakota was not only promised, but was specifically authorized as an integral part of the Missouri River Basin project in the Flood Control Act of 1944, to partially offset the loss experienced in the State by the acquisition of over 550,000 acres of valuable agricultural lands by the Federal Government for the construction of the Garrison and Oahe Dam and Reservoir projects on the Missouri River; and

Whereas the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation has determined from exhaustive studies and investigations conducted over the past 20 years, that the multiple-purpose Garrison diversion unit and irrigation development proposed therein is engineeringly and economically justifiable and feasible; and

Whereas legislation that would reauthorize the Garrison diversion unit has been proposed in each Congress since 1957, and has been the subject of extensive and thorough congressional hearings held during the intervening years, at which strong and consistent project support has been given by the State's congressional delegation, Governor, legislature, potential irrigators, farm, business, labor, industrial, professional, and agricultural organizations and leaders, as well as from basinwide and national water resources organizations, and by the last two administrations; and

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of my amendment and the text of a letter from the New York State Conference of Mayors to the President of the United States describing the need for modification in the existing water pollution legislation.

There being no objection, the amendment and letter were referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 4

On page 5, beginning with line 11, strike out all through line 17, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 4. (a) Subsections (b) and (c) of the section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act herein redesignated as section 8 are amended to read as follows:

"(b) Federal grants under this section shall be subject to the following limitations: (1) No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to this section unless such project shall have been approved by the appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies and by the Secretary and unless such project is included in a comprehensive program developed pursuant to this Act; (2) no grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 30 per centum of the estimated reasonable cost thereof as determined by the Secretary: *Provided*, That the grantee agrees to pay the remaining cost: *Provided further*, That, in the case of a project which will serve more than one municipality the Secretary shall, on such basis as he determines to be reasonable and equitable, allocate to each municipality to be served by such project its share of the estimated reasonable cost of such project, and shall then apply the limitation provided in this clause (2) to each such share as if it were a separate project to determine the maximum amount of any grant which could be made under this section with respect to each such share; (3) no grant shall be made for any project under this section until the applicant has made provision satisfactory to the Secretary for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the treatment works after completion of the construction thereof; and (4) no grant shall be made for any project under this section unless such project is in conformity with the State water pollution control plan submitted pursuant to the provisions of section 7 and has been certified by the State water pollution control agency (A) as entitled to priority over other eligible projects on the basis of financial as well as water pollution control needs, or (B) for reimbursement pursuant to subsection (c).

"(c) In determining the desirability of projects for treatment works and of approving Federal financial aid in connection therewith, consideration shall be given by the Secretary to the public benefits to be derived by the construction and the propriety of Federal aid in such construction, the relation of the ultimate cost of constructing and maintaining the works to the public interest and to the public necessity for the works, and the adequacy of the provisions made or proposed by the applicant for such Federal financial aid for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the treatment works after completion of the construction thereof. The sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (d) for any fiscal year shall be allotted by the Secretary from time to time, in accordance with regulations, as follows: (1) 50 per centum of such sums in the ratio that the population of each State bears to the population of all the States, and (2) 50 per centum of such sums in the ratio that the urban population of each State bears to the urban population of all the States. Sums allotted to a State under the preceding sentence which

are not obligated within six months following the end of the fiscal year for which they were allotted because of a lack of projects which have been approved by the State water pollution control agency under subsection (b) (1) of this section and certified under subsection (b) (4) of this section, shall be reallocated by the Secretary, on such basis as he determines to be reasonable and equitable and in accordance with regulations promulgated by him, to States having projects approved under this section for which grants have not been made because of lack of funds: *Provided, however*, That whenever a State has funds subject to reallocation and the Secretary finds that the need for a project in a community in such State is due in part to any Federal institution or Federal construction activity, he may, prior to such reallocation, make an additional grant with respect to such project which will in his judgment reflect an equitable contribution for the need caused by such Federal institution or activity. Any sum made available to a State by reallocation under the preceding sentence shall be in addition to any funds otherwise allotted to such State under this Act. The allotments of a State under the second and third sentences of this subsection shall be available, in accordance with the provisions of this section, for payments with respect to projects in such State which have been approved under this section, except that in the case of any project constructed in such State after the date of enactment of the Water Quality Act of 1964 which meets the requirements for assistance under this section but was constructed without such assistance, such allotments shall also be available for payments in reimbursement of State or local funds used for such project to the extent that assistance could have been provided under this section if such project had been approved pursuant to this section and funds available. For purposes of this section, population, including urban population, shall be determined on the basis of the latest decennial census for which figures are available, as certified by the Secretary of Commerce."

(b) Subsection (d) of such section 8 is amended by striking out the colon preceding the word "*Provided*" and all after such colon to the period at the end of such subsection.

NEW YORK STATE CONFERENCE OF MAYORS AND OTHER MUNICIPAL OFFICIALS,

Albany, N.Y., January 11, 1965.

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On the 30th of December last, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of our State, wrote to you urging that you exercise your leadership and influence to make the sewage disposal assistance program of the Federal Government, under Public Law 660, a more realistic and effective tool in the vital fight for water pollution abatement.

As representatives of the 12.5 million persons who live in the cities and villages of New York State, and on behalf of all 16.8 million of our citizens in the State, we, too, urge you most vigorously to take such action.

The money heretofore allocated to projects in our State has helped us to make significant progress in the water pollution abatement fight. Unfortunately, however, most of the progress to date has come about through the solution of the less complex and less expensive problems.

As reported by the temporary State commission on water resources planning, we now face the hard core of the more complex, more difficult, and more expensive pollution problems. These are our biggest and our worst problems. These are the ones thrusting the burden of financial hardship most severely upon our communities.

The relatively small amount of money allocated to the State of New York, and the strict dollar limitation placed upon each project combine to make the Federal program completely inadequate to help us meet our present situation.

We feel a particular concern because in almost every, if not every, Federal assistance program the taxpayers of our State pay so much more into the program in taxes than we receive back in assistance. In the particular matter of water pollution abatement we feel that the magnitude of our problems, like the needs of New York City where a single project cost \$87.6 million, and with the allocation of Federal funds falling far short of meeting the requirements for the projects submitted for approval each year, merits our receiving a full share of Federal assistance for this vital activity.

We therefore urge upon you, most respectfully, yet most emphatically, the necessity and the equity of a program in which the Federal Government will assume financial responsibility for a full 30 percent of the cost of all approved sewage disposal facility construction, without any dollar restriction upon any project. We concurrently urge our State to assume a similar share of the cost, a program to which our Governor already has committed himself.

The citizens of the State of New York, and particularly its 12.5 million urban residents, urgently need and will deeply appreciate your utmost assistance in this matter.

Respectfully yours,

RAYMOND J. COTHRAIN,
Executive Director.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT, AS AMENDED (AMENDMENT NO. 5)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to S. 4, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended.

Last year, although I was in sympathy with the objectives of the bill introduced by Senator MUSKIE, and passed by the Senate. I opposed the bill because I believed it vested absolute power in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, or in his Assistant Secretary, to fix standards of water quality applicable to interstate water.

The amendment which I send to the desk, and which I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD, would establish procedures that would, at minimum, give to the States and to interstate agencies acting under compacts, municipalities, and industries which are directly concerned the right to be heard concerning water quality standards, promulgated by the Secretary, to present their views in a public hearing after the standard had been published and to propose revisions of such water quality standards; and finally the right of appeal to the Circuit Courts of Appeals.

The procedures which I propose, would assure justice to the States and other interested parties. They would not obstruct the essential purpose of the bill—to establish water quality standards. They would assure the standards which the Secretary promulgates are in accord with the criteria under which he is required to act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received and appropriately referred. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Public Works; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 5) is as follows:

Beginning with line 13, page 7, strike out all to and including line 14, page 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) (1) In order to carry out the purpose of this Act, the Secretary may, after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and with other Federal agencies, with State and interstate water pollution control agencies, and with municipalities and industries involved, to obtain the views of such officer and such agencies, municipalities, and industries, and after such public hearings as he may deem advisable, prepare proposed regulations setting forth standards of water quality to be applicable to interstate waters or portions thereof.

"(2) Standards of quality prescribed by regulations adopted under paragraph (1) shall be such as to protect the public health and welfare and carry into effect the purposes of this Act. In establishing such standards with respect to any waters, there shall be taken into consideration (A) the use and value of such waters for public water supplies, agricultural, industrial and commercial use, the propagation of fish and wildlife resources.

"(3) Such proposed regulations shall be published in the Federal Register, and copies thereof shall be transmitted to all Federal, State and interstate water pollution control agencies, municipalities, and industrial organizations involved. Upon request made within ninety days after publication of such proposed regulations by one or more of the States, interstate agencies, municipalities, and industrial organizations (referred to hereinafter as 'interested parties') affected, the Secretary shall conduct public hearings upon such proposed regulations at a place convenient to the interested parties. In any such hearing, interested parties shall be accorded adequate opportunity to obtain and present necessary evidence in support of their contentions, and shall be entitled to propose revisions and modifications of the proposed regulations. Upon the basis of all evidence received in any such hearing, the Secretary shall prepare and transmit to each party to the hearing his report thereon, which shall contain a full and complete statement of his findings of fact and his conclusions with respect to issues presented at the hearing. The Secretary may, thereupon, affirm, rescind, or modify in whole or in part such proposed regulation.

"(4) If any interested party is dissatisfied with the Secretary's action with respect to it under this subsection, it may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State (or any of the member States, in the case of an interstate agency) is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The findings of fact by the Secretary, unless contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Secretary to take further evidence, and the Secretary may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless contrary to the weight of the evidence. The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Secretary or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as pro-

vided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"(5) Such regulations shall become effective only if, within a reasonable time after being requested by the Secretary to do so, the appropriate States and interstate agencies have not developed standards found by the Secretary to be consistent with paragraph (2) of this subsection and applicable to such interstate waters or portions thereof."

Bulfinch
AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT (AMENDMENT NO. 6)

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to S. 436, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, which I introduced on January 12. My amendment is technical and corrective in nature, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 6) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

On page 2, line 11, after "assigned" insert "annually thereafter".

On page 16, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following new subsection:

"(c) Section 272(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1322) is amended (1) by deleting '(3) an epileptic,' and (2) by redesignating clauses '(4)', '(5)', '(6)', '(7)', and '(8)', as clauses '(3)', '(4)', '(5)', '(6)', and '(7)', respectively."

BANKING AND CURRENCY
SUBCOMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Banking and Currency Committee had its organization meeting this morning. I ask unanimous consent that the assignments of the members of the committee to subcommittees be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the assignments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY
SUBCOMMITTEES

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS
Robertson, chairman; Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams, Muskie, Long, Bennett, Tower, and Thurmond.

HOUSING
Sparkman, chairman; Douglas, Proxmire, Williams, Muskie, Long, McIntyre, Tower, Bennett, and Hickenlooper.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE
Muskie, chairman; Sparkman, Proxmire, Williams, Neuberger, McIntyre, Mondale, Hickenlooper, Bennett, and Tower.

PRODUCTION AND STABILIZATION
Douglas, chairman; Robertson, Proxmire, Muskie, Long, Neuberger, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, and Thurmond.

SECURITIES
Williams, chairman; Robertson, Muskie, Long, Neuberger, McIntyre, Mondale, Thurmond, Bennett, and Hickenlooper.

SMALL BUSINESS
Proxmire, chairman; Robertson, Sparkman, Douglas, Neuberger, McIntyre, Mondale, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

AUTHORITY TO FILE REPORT TOMORROW ON S. 3, APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT BILL

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may file a report tomorrow, Wednesday, January 27, irrespective of whether the Senate be in session, on S. 3, the Appalachian regional development bill, this report to come from me through the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKE-SHORE BILL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at next printing the names of the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] be added as additional cosponsors of S. 360, to establish the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.

This makes a total of 33 Senators, which is an imposing number.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added to S. 507 at the next printing of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] be added as a cosponsor of S. 100, a bill to establish a Department of Education.

I also ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the names of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] be added as a cosponsor of S. 488, a bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to assist States and communities to establish programs for the identification, care and treatment of children who are or are in danger of becoming emotionally disturbed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WEST COAST DISASTER RELIEF—
ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill, S. 327, the names of the Senators from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. GRUENING] be added as cosponsors.

hearings in executive session and that Rule XI, 26(m), was operative in that the area of interrogation of these three witnesses might tend to defame, degrade or incriminate persons other than the witnesses. It was suggested that Mr. ICHORD prepare a statement on behalf of the subcommittee, the contents of which were unanimously approved by the subcommittee, and which Mr. ICHORD was to deliver upon the reconvening of the subcommittee following the recess.

"On motion of Mr. ICHORD, seconded by Mr. Johansen and unanimously adopted, it was agreed that the requests of Mr. Nixon, Mrs. Wilson and Mrs. Allen, should again be denied.

"The meeting recessed at 2:45 p.m.

"JOE R. POOL,

"Chairman.

"JULIETTE P. JORAY,
Recording Secretary."

10. The following is an extract of the minutes of the aforesaid subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities held on December 7, 1964, at 4:05 p.m.:

"A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities designated by the chairman on November 25, 1964, to sit at hearings in the matter of entry of aliens in the United States under waiver of ineligibility, met in executive session on December 7, 1964, in room 219 of the Cannon House Office Building at 4:05 p.m. The following members were present: Joe R. Pool, chairman; Richard Ichord, August E. Johansen. Representative Donald C. Bruce was also present.

"The staff members present were Francis J. McNamara, director; Alfred M. Nittle, counsel; Donald T. Appell, chief investigator; and Juliette P. Joray, recording clerk.

"The subcommittee was called to order by the chairman who stated that the purpose of the meeting was to consider what action the subcommittee should take regarding the refusal of Russell Nixon to be sworn or examine as a witness; and the failures of Dagmar Wilson and Donna Allen to testify at the hearing conducted by the said subcommittee on the 7th day of December 1964, and what recommendation it would make to the full committee regarding their citation for contempt of the House of Representatives.

"After full discussion of the refusal of Russell Nixon to be sworn or examined as a witness, a motion was made by Mr. ICHORD, seconded by Mr. Johansen, and unanimously carried that a report of the facts relating to the refusal of Russell Nixon to be sworn as a witness and to answer any question before the said subcommittee at the hearing aforesaid, be referred and submitted to the Committee on Un-American Activities as a whole, with the recommendation that a report of the facts relating to the refusal of said witness to be sworn and answer any questions, together with all of the facts in connection therewith, be referred to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, with the recommendation that the said witness be cited for contempt of the House of Representatives, to the end that he may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

"The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

"JOE R. POOL,

"Chairman.

"JULIETTE P. JORAY,
Recording Clerk."

11. The following is an extract of the minutes of a meeting of the full Committee on Un-American Activities held on December 10, 1964 at 10 a.m.:

"The Committee on Un-American Activities met in executive session on Thursday morning, December 10, 1964, in room 225, Cannon House Office Building, at 10 o'clock a.m. The following members were present: Edwin E. Willis, chairman; William Tuck, Joe R. Pool, Richard Ichord, Donald C. Bruce.

"Also present were the following staff members: Francis J. McNamara, director; William Hitz, general counsel; Alfred M. Nittle,

counsel; Donald T. Appell, chief investigator; Philip Manuel, investigator; and Juliette P. Joray, recording clerk.

"Chairman Willis called the meeting to order at 10:18 a.m., and announced that this special meeting of the committee was called, after notice to all committee members, for the purpose of considering a recommendation of the subcommittee headed by Mr. Pool, looking into the entry of aliens into the United States under waiver of ineligibility, that Russell Nixon, Dagmar Wilson and Donna Allen be cited for contempt because of their refusals to testify before the subcommittee in executive session on Monday of this week, December 7.

"The chairman then directed Mr. Pool, chairman of the subcommittee, to report on the matter being considered by the committee.

"Representative Pool reported to the committee that he was chairman of the subcommittee appointed by the chairman, composed of himself, Representatives Richard H. Ichord and August E. Johansen, to conduct hearings on December 7, 1964, at Washington, D.C., as contemplated under the resolution adopted by the committee on the 19th day of February 1964; that the subcommittee met in executive session on December 7, 1964, in the Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C., to receive the testimony of Russell Nixon, Donna Allen, and Dagmar Wilson who had been duly subpoenaed to appear as witnesses before said subcommittee; the said meeting of the subcommittee was attended on December 7, 1964, by subcommittee chairman, Representative Joe R. Pool, and Representatives Richard H. Ichord and August E. Johansen; that the witness, Russell Nixon, having appeared before the subcommittee, refused to be sworn or examined as a witness, willfully refused to answer any question pertinent to the question under inquiry, and willfully refused to give any testimony touching matters of inquiry committed before said subcommittee; that the said Donna Allen appeared before the subcommittee, was administered an affirmation as a witness by the subcommittee chairman, but willfully refused to testify in response to any question pertinent to the question or subject under inquiry; that the said Dagmar Wilson appeared before the subcommittee, was duly sworn as a witness, and when asked to state her name and residence for the record and whether she was represented by counsel, she responded to those questions, but thereupon and thereafter willfully refused to answer any question pertinent to the question under inquiry and willfully refused to give any testimony touching matters of inquiry before said subcommittee as required by her subpoena; that the subcommittee thereafter met in executive session, attended by the said subcommittee chairman, Representative Pool, and Representatives Ichord and Johansen, being all of the members of the said subcommittee; at which time, motions were made and unanimously adopted with respect to each of said persons, to wit, Russell Nixon, Donna Allen, and Dagmar Wilson, that a report of the facts relating to the refusal of each of them to testify before said subcommittee at said hearings after having been summoned to appear to testify before said subcommittee, be referred and submitted to the Committee on Un-American Activities as a whole, with a recommendation that a report and statement of fact with reference to the refusal of each of said witnesses to appear to testify as aforesaid, be made to and filed with the Speaker of the House, the House now being adjourned sine die, in order that the said Speaker may certify the same under the seal of the House, to the appropriate U.S. attorney to the end that each of said witnesses may be proceeded against for contempt of the House of Representatives in the manner and form provided by law.

"A motion was made by Mr. Pool, seconded by Mr. Bruce, that the subcommittee's report of the facts relating to the refusal of Russell Nixon to be sworn as a witness and to testify before the said subcommittee at the hearings conducted before it in Washington, D.C., on the 7th day of December 1964, be and the same is hereby approved and adopted, and that the Committee on Un-American Activities report the said failures of Russell Nixon to the Honorable John McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives, the House of Representatives now being adjourned sine die, in order that the said Speaker may certify the same to the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia to the end that the said Russell Nixon may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law; and that the chairman of this committee is hereby authorized and directed to forward such report and statement of fact constituting such failure of Russell Nixon to the said Speaker of the House of Representatives. Following discussion, the motion was put to a vote and it was unanimously adopted. Mr. Pool asked for the yeas and nays to be recorded. The yeas and nays were taken. Mr. Willis voted "yea," Mr. Tuck voted "yea," Mr. Pool voted "yea," Mr. Ichord voted "yea," and Mr. Bruce voted "yea." Mr. Bruce also stated that he was authorized to vote the proxy of Mr. Johansen and that if he were present he would vote yea. So the motion was agreed to.

"The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

"EDWIN E. WILLIS,

"Chairman.

"JULIETTE P. JORAY,

"Recording Clerk."

Bill file

IMMIGRATION HEARINGS

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to announce that the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality will commence hearings on immigration legislation on February 16 at 10 a.m. Arrangements are now being made to schedule witnesses to appear before the subcommittee.

Administration spokesmen will be called to testify on changes made in the administration proposal on which hearings were held by the subcommittee during the 88th Congress.

Opportunity will be provided interested organizations and individuals who wish to present their views on immigration legislation.

The schedule of hearings will be arranged so that prompt action can be taken to bring reform immigration legislation to the floor of the House early in this session.

THE ELDERCARE ACT OF 1965

(Mr. HERLONG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, along with Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS of Missouri I have today introduced legislation, the Eldercare Act of 1965, that would amend the Kerr-Mills law to authorize broad health insurance coverage for elderly persons.

The bipartisan Herlong-Curtis bill would authorize Federal grants to the States on a matching basis to help persons 65 years of age and older pay costs of the health insurance if they could not

afford it otherwise. The bill would provide for utilization of Blue Shield and Blue Cross plans and private health insurance companies.

The cost of such coverage would be borne entirely by Government for those elderly individuals whose income falls below limits set by each State. For individuals with incomes between the minimum and a maximum, Government would pay a part of the cost on a sliding scale according to income. Individuals with income above the maximum would pay the entire cost, but they would have the benefits of an income tax deduction for such payments, as well as statewide bargaining for noncancellable health care policies.

Persons under 65 years of age also would be given an income tax deduction for the amount of premiums paid on noncancellable health insurance policies to become effective upon retirement.

States could administer the program under State health departments if they so chose. The Kerr-Mills program now is administered by State welfare departments.

It was expected that the Herlong-Curtis bill would be supported by the American Medical Association which recently announced such a plan—the doctors' eldercare program.

Both Herlong and Curtis are members of the House Ways and Means Committee which has made health-care-for-the-elderly legislation its first business of this session with deliberations on it in closed meetings starting today.

In a joint statement, Herlong and Curtis said:

Our legislation is designed to provide elderly persons all the medical services they require, in contrast to the limited benefits in the King-Anderson social security tax bill. Under our bill, workers would not be taxed to pay for hospitalization of those who are financially able to pay for it themselves.

This legislation would not endanger the solvency of the social security fund or permit control of local hospitals by a Federal bureaucracy, as the King-Anderson proposal could.

This bill goes to the real problem: helping those who need help in financing their health care. That problem would still remain after these individuals had used up the limited benefits of the King-Anderson bill. Why levy a new tax and set up another Federal bureaucracy when it will not do the full job?

A summary of the Herlong-Curtis bill follows:

ELDERCARE ACT OF 1965

HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE UNDER MAA

This bill would amend title I (old age assistance and medical assistance for the aged) and title XVI (aid to the aged, blind, or disabled, or such aid and medical assistance for the aged) of the Social Security Act to add a new section under which a State with an MAA program would be authorized, in its discretion, to provide the MAA in the form of premium payments for health insurance coverage under voluntary private health insurance plans in addition to providing the assistance in the manner authorized under existing law. A State wishing to participate in the program would be required to enter into contracts or other arrangements with private insurance carriers as it deems appropriate.

The contracts would have to: (1) be guaranteed renewable; (2) provide benefits which,

together with MAA benefits authorized in existing law, include both institutional and noninstitutional care; (3) establish enrollment periods not less often than once a year; and (4) contain such other provisions as the State agency determines are necessary to carry out the purposes of the program.

If a State provides an MAA program in the form of health insurance coverage, the same coverage would have to be available to all individuals who reside in the State and who are 65 or over. In the case of old age assistance recipients (or aged recipients of aid to the aged, blind, or disabled under title XVI), at the discretion of the State, the coverage may be in lieu of or in addition to aid provided in the form of medical or remedial care under existing law. The bill provides that premium payments for such coverage would constitute medical or remedial care for aged recipients under the two titles.

The bill provides that premiums for coverage of any individual under an insurance plan would be paid by the State agency with the following two exceptions. The State agency could establish a maximum income level at least equal to the highest level at which an individual may qualify under the MAA program in the State. If the individual's income is above this level, the premiums would be paid in part by the individual and in part by the State agency in proportions based on the individual's income as the State agency may determine up to a higher income level as the State agency determines to be appropriate. If the individual's income is above the higher level, he would be required to pay the premium in full. Income standards for eligibility would have to be "reasonable".

For the purposes of the bill, "income" would include gross income as defined under the Internal Revenue Code and all other income which is not includible in gross income for tax purposes.

Each individual covered under an insurance plan under the program would be required to certify his income to the State agency in a manner and at such times (but at least once a year) as the State agency may require. The State agency would be required to accept the certification as conclusive. The certification would be subject to the penalties for fraud under the Social Security Act (a fine of up to \$1,000, or imprisonment for up to 1 year, or both).

The bill would provide that medical assistance for the aged would be provided in behalf of individuals who are not recipients of OAA but whose income (rather than income and resources) is insufficient to meet the cost of necessary medical services.

The bill provides that, notwithstanding the provisions of existing law, if a State plan under title I or XVI includes both MAA and old age assistance or aid to the aged, blind, or disabled, the State could designate one State agency to administer or supervise the portion of the plan that relates to old age assistance (or aid to the aged, blind, or disabled), and a separate State agency to administer the medical assistance for the aged plan.

The bill would modify the prohibition in existing law against enrollment fees by providing an exemption for a State plan which provides medical assistance for the aged in the form of health insurance coverage.

The bill would amend the provisions of titles I and XVI which describe the purposes or appropriations to include encouragement for "each State to provide medical assistance for all aged individuals through the utilization of insurance provided by private insurance carriers."

The bill provides that States which provide MAA through the use of health insurance plans would have their Federal contributions increased by 5 percent (to 52.5-84 percent rather than 50-80 percent) of

sums expended for medical or remedial care. A State which provides medical care using the health insurance plan under the old-age assistance program or the combined program of aid to the aged, blind, or disabled, would also have its Federal contribution increased by 5 percent (to 52.5-88.25 percent rather than 50-85 percent).

Further, the Federal Government would contribute toward the cost of administration of the health insurance program on the same basis as it does under the OAA and MAA programs.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE FOR MENTALLY ILL AND TUBERCULOUS

The bill would amend title I (old-age assistance and medical assistance for the aged) and title XVI (aid to the aged, blind, or disabled, and medical assistance for the aged) of the Social Security Act to authorize money payments to, or medical care in behalf of, needy individuals who are 65 years or age or over unless the individual is an inmate in a public institution other than a patient in a medical institution.

Thus, payments or care could be provided to any needy individual who is a patient in an institution for tuberculosis or mental disease. Payments could be made to an individual who has been diagnosed as having tuberculosis or psychosis and who is a patient in a medical institution as a result thereof, and care could be provided to an individual who is a patient in a medical institution as a result of a diagnosis of tuberculosis or psychosis without regard to the 42-day limitation contained in existing law. However, under the combined program of aid to the aged, blind, or disabled (title XVI), such payments or care could not be made or provided to or in behalf of any individual in an institution for tuberculosis or mental disease if he is under age 65.

INTERNAL REVENUE CODE AMENDMENTS

The bill would make the following amendments to the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which relate to medical expense deductions:

1. If neither the taxpayer nor his spouse has attained the age of 65, they would be authorized a deduction equal to—

(a) The uncompensated amount spent for medical care for any dependent who has attained the age of 65;

(b) The amount paid for accident or health insurance for the taxpayer or his spouse which by its terms would become effective when either has attained the age of 65; and

(c) Uncompensated medical expenses incurred on behalf of the taxpayer, his spouse, and other dependents which exceed 3 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income.

2. If the taxpayer or his spouse has attained the age of 65, there would be no limitation on the deduction for uncompensated medical expenses incurred in behalf of the taxpayer, his spouse, or dependents over age 65. However, the deduction in behalf of dependents under age 65 would continue to be subject to the 3-percent limitation.

For the purposes of the above amendments, a dependent over age 65 would mean any individual who is related to the taxpayer, or who is a member of the taxpayer's household (as defined by the Internal Revenue Code) regardless of the amount of support the individual receives from the taxpayer. (A dependent under existing law is one who receives over half his support from the taxpayer.)

The amendments relating to the health insurance program would become effective July 1, 1966, but a State could make them effective any time after the first day of any quarter after the date of the bill's enactment. The amendments relating to the income tax deductions would become effective for taxable years after the bill's enactment.

1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

1387

4 hours on the formal discussion in the Committee of Labor and Public Welfare in the Senate. We are hearing talk now about this astronomical program and its good points. We aren't going to argue with that. It has its good objectives. But we hear about jamming this through by July 1. These programs have to be studied. They have to be explained to the American people. We have to recognize that the aims are great but we also have to find out what threats are in them, against freedom.

We hear about the Great Society. I would remind you we have been a Great Society all of our lives. If we weren't my Grandfather would never have gotten here from Poland or England because there would have been no reason. He wanted to be free. Yet we hear in this Great Society today, justice, liberty, and unity. I might remind you that we find justice in jails. We find liberty among Communist-controlled people, to some extent. Unity, there is unity amongst the Communists. There is unity amongst criminals, but freedom is the major ingredient of our society and without it these things mean nothing and once again as I did during the campaign I implore the President to talk about freedom as he talks about justice, liberty, and unity because liberty and freedom are not exactly the same things.

Now, in closing, I want to say what Dick has said. I am a Republican. I have always been a Republican. I will never feel at home any place else. I will resist any third party movement in this country, and I will never allow my name to be associated with any such movement.

This Republican Party lives under a great tent. We have room in it for all interpretations of our basic philosophy. I said, I say now, as I said in Chicago 5 years ago, let's not stand inside this tent and throw rocks at each other. You can stand outside and throw rocks, but not inside. If you have your arguing to do, whether you are liberal, moderate, or conservative, whatever those words mean today, let's argue them out between now and 1966. When we have decided our nominees for the House and Senate, for the gubernatorial posts in 1966, just because we don't agree, for the "love of Mike" don't stay home and throw rocks at the candidate.

I want to thank all of you for the great honor that you bestowed on me by having selected me as your candidate—20-20 hindsight might make some of you wish you hadn't done it—20-20 hindsight can show me a lot wrong with the decision but it was your decision and I never have been so honored in my life.

I will never be so honored again. I will carry this honor to my grave as the proudest thing I own. Thank you.

REVISION OF IMMIGRATION LAWS

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. DEL CLAWSON) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, as one who supports reasonable revision of the immigration laws, I was struck by a thoughtful analysis of the problems involved which appeared as an editorial in the January 14 issue of the Christian Science Monitor. I welcome this opportunity to place it in the Record for the consideration of the House:

WHAT IMMIGRATION LAW?

As the next step in what promises to be one of the most tradition-shattering legislative programs ever asked by a President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson has

demanding fargoing changes in American immigration laws.

There has been for many years a sharp division within public thought on this question. On one side have stood those who believe that all nations have the right to preserve their traditional racial, religious, and cultural make-up against inflows which might seriously alter it. This group, hitherto dominant, points out that the United States, despite heavy immigration from many areas of the world, remains essentially northern European and Protestant.

Against this point of view are ranged those who claim that America's immigrant laws are discriminatory, that the United States should not make nationality a test for immigration. These would have the famed "melting pot" melt still more furiously. They would consider would-be immigrants as individual human beings rather than members of nations or races.

Although by no means adopting all the demands of the most extreme within this latter group, President Johnson has clearly responded to their pleas. Although not substantially lifting the yearly immigration quota (which, incidentally, does not give a true picture as it is exceeded each year by almost its own number due to special visas), the President's wish is to end the present preferential treatment given northern Europeans, primarily British, German, Irish, and Scandinavian.

The White House lays particular stress on what it says is the need to import workers with needed skills. The new bill would also further serve the already operative and humanitarian principle of seeking to unite families.

A serious question, and one which the President did not even touch upon in his message, is the desirability—one might even term it the "humanity"—of seeking to open the gates to large numbers of persons with greater or lesser skills, while there are millions of unemployed in the United States, while automation has already thrown many skilled workers out of a job, while large numbers of Negroes and Puerto Ricans are either unemployed or underemployed. But even these facts are less significant than still another: the United States is now entering the period when the postwar baby boom begins to flood the labor market. In the next 10 years alone, this boom will add 15 million jobseekers over and above the figure of those normally expected. Where will they find jobs?

From a hardheaded point of view, the United States might be expected under such circumstances to cut down on immigration, rather than seek to increase it. Many other countries follow such a course. But would it be consistent with American ideals?

Thus difficult questions arise. If, in this matter, one shows a humanitarian face to the world, is one showing a heartless face to unfortunates at home? Is an improvement in America's worldwide "image" worth the price of possibly compounding already existent economic difficulties? Clearly, such choices require careful weighing.

WIDENED FOOD-FOR-PEACE PROGRAM

(Mr. KASTENMEIER (at the request of Mr. CLEVENGER) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which would provide a new and useful method of expanding overseas markets for U.S.-produced foodstuffs, increasing our dollar trade, and adding in the economic development of recipient countries.

The bill would add a new chapter, chapter 7 to part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, to authorize long-term supply contracts for school lunch and welfare programs abroad. This chapter would authorize the President to make firm commitments for any period of up to 5 years after the Secretary of Agriculture made a determination that the commodity in question is reasonably likely to continue in surplus for that period.

This authority for firm commitments on the strength of estimated future supply conditions is the most significant contribution of this proposal. The bill would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to make open-market purchases at above-price-support levels to fill the commitments should our surplus supply become depleted during the period of the commitment. Existing law requires a determination at the time of delivery that the commodity is then in surplus before it may be shipped. This results in great uncertainty for the recipient country.

Elimination of this uncertainty is highly desirable, not solely for the convenience of recipient countries, but very importantly, for the U.S. producers, processors and shippers.

In the face of the existing uncertainty potential participating countries are discouraged from investing in the storage, packaging, and distribution facilities needed to receive both governmental shipments and commercial sales through private channels. Where the products might be used for such politically sensitive purposes as welfare and school lunch distributions, there is an even greater disinclination to embark on a program which might have to be terminated because of supply conditions in the United States.

In a recent article appearing in the Washington Post on January 21, 1965, Dan Kurzman cited the growing interest of the Johnson administration in utilizing food more fully in our foreign policy. We who view food and our ability to produce surplus stocks of food as very effective foreign policy tools are greatly encouraged by this indication of the administration's willingness to consider and support measures similar to the bill I am introducing today. In the belief that this article is of interest to my colleagues and relevant to the measure I am proposing, I include with my remarks the text of that article:

WIDENED FOOD-FOR-PEACE PROGRAM IS PLANNED

(By Dan Kurzman)

A revolutionary food-for-peace program to help end hunger in the free world is being planned by the administration.

The program would require new legislation to permit basic changes in this country's farm policy.

Under the current food-for-peace program, only agricultural products in surplus can be shipped abroad as aid. Under the one now being drawn up, non-surplus foods would also be sent abroad, mainly high-protein items such as soybeans and dairy products selected to fight malnutrition.

CHANGES IN SUBSIDIES

To assure an adequate supply of the most needed foods, important readjustments in

1388

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

the Government's farm subsidy program would be necessary.

Subsidies intended to cut production of items that would be required for the anti-hunger campaign could be reduced or eliminated while new incentives might be needed to encourage rather than discourage the cultivation of certain crops.

The projected program would implement a proposal by President Johnson last October "to use food and agricultural skills of the entire West in a joint effort to eliminate hunger and starvation." The program is now being worked out jointly by the Department of Agriculture, the Agency for International Development (AID), food for peace, and the Bureau of the Budget.

Although the total program might cost more than the present one, U.S. officials pointed out, an increase in the farm budget probably would not be required since a large part of the cost could be shifted from the Department of Agriculture to AID.

BUDGET PROPOSAL

Such a shift would depend on the willingness of Congress to give food a priority place within the AID program—an uncertainty at best, particularly since the President has asked for a sharply trimmed AID budget for fiscal 1966, starting in July.

However, since increased funds for food would not be required until fiscal 1967, a decision by the President to push the program could help make the funds available then or later.

Actually, pilot projects, which would not require any change in present farm or AID budgets, may be launched this year. From three to six underdeveloped countries will probably be selected to test the practicability of the program. Administration officials feel that for the first time in history the means exist for eliminating world starvation, and that the Great Society can prove itself on a global basis by so doing.

POLITICAL RESULTS SEEN

A successful worldwide anti-hunger campaign, officials believe, would, at minimum cost, not only eliminate one of mankind's most deadly plagues, but produce tremendous political results, particularly since the Communist world cannot produce enough food for itself.

Such a program is possible now, these officials say, because the scope of world hunger can be measured for the first time as a result of an intensive survey made about a year ago by the Department of Agriculture. This survey was made possible by the Freedom From Hunger campaign started in 1961 by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, which made governments more aware of the need for statistics to tie down food requirements.

The world food shortage is estimated in terms of yearly value, at \$6.8 billion, of which \$2.5 billion is attributed to non-Communist countries. These figures take into account the present annual food-for-peace offerings of \$1.6 billion and the less than \$500 million contributed yearly by other nations.

Built into the projected program would be efforts to reduce the \$2.5 billion free world gap through self-help measures undertaken by the needy nations.

HUGE CROP LOSSES

These measures would be designed first to improve the storing and distribution of available food. India today loses almost one-third of its crop through rats, insect infestation, and spoilage, while Chile loses up to half of its fruit and vegetables because of the lack of proper canning facilities.

Second, increased local food production would be encouraged through greater use of fertilizer, increased farm credits, and technical aid, and new marketing facilities. Such self-help measures constitute the main effort of the FAO's Freedom From Hunger campaign.

Food shortages remaining after such measures were undertaken—and after normal commercial trade with food exporting countries was taken into account—would then be met under the new program, assuring that such aid represented the assistance that the hungry people could not provide for themselves.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 5 minutes, tomorrow, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. GROSS, for 30 minutes, on Thursday, January 28.

Mr. SAYLOR (at the request of Mr. DEL CLAWSON), for 15 minutes, on Thursday, January 28, 1965; to revise and extend and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WHITENER (at the request of Mr. CLEVINGER), for 30 minutes, on Monday, February 1, 1965; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEL CLAWSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ADAIR.

Mrs. DWYER in two instances.

Mr. CLEVELAND in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. CLEVELAND in two instances.

Mr. MICHEL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CLEVINGER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. KELLY.

Mr. MULTER in three instances.

Mr. BOGGS in three instances.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida in five instances.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER in two instances.

Mr. ROONEY of New York in two instances.

Mr. IRWIN.

Mr. STEPHENS.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 28, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

434. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A joint resolution to authorize the disposal of chromium metal, acid grade fluorspar, and silicon carbide from the supplemental stockpile"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

435. A letter from the Acting Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, trans-

mitting a report on the Veterans' Administration's activities in the disposal of foreign excess property for calendar year 1964, pursuant to title IV, section 404(d), Public Law 81-152; to the Committee on Government Operations.

436. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract for services, etc., for the public at the Oak Bottom site in the Whiskeytown Reservoir Area, Calif., pursuant to 67 Stat. 271, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 3699. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to expand and improve services under the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, to provide special funds for training professional personnel for providing health services for crippled children, to provide for a program of medical assistance for children and other persons whose income and resources are insufficient to meet the cost of necessary medical care and services, to enable States to implement and follow up their planning and other activities leading to comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 3700. A bill declaring Columbus Day to be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3701. A bill to authorize a 2-year program of Federal financial assistance for all elementary and secondary school children in all of the States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CABELL:

H.R. 3702. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against income tax for a taxpayer with one or more children in college; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 3703. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from 18 to 22, in the case of a child attending school, the age until which child's insurance benefits may be paid thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3704. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide a new system of overtime compensation for postal field service employees, to eliminate compensatory time in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3705. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide that the entire cost of health benefits under such act shall be paid by the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3706. A bill to prevent the use of stop-watches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3707. A bill to improve the annuity computation formula for certain employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 3708. A bill to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of

1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

1407

EDUCATION AND HEALTH

In my message on education I proposed a program to insure an opportunity to every American child to develop to the full his mind and his skills.

In my message on health I proposed a massive new attack on diseases which afflict mankind.

We value education and health for their direct benefits to human understanding and happiness. But they also yield major economic benefits.

Investments in human resources are among our most profitable investments. Such investments raise individual productivity and incomes, with benefits to our whole society. They raise our rate of economic growth, increase our economy's efficiency and flexibility, and form the cornerstone of our attack on poverty.

I believe that the Congress will find economic as well as human reasons to support my proposals on education and health.

CONCLUSION

In our economic affairs, as in every other aspect of our lives, ceaseless change is the one constant.

Revolutionary changes in technology, in forms of economic organization, in commercial relations with our neighbors, in the structure and education of our labor force converge in our markets. Free choices in free markets—as always—accommodate these tides of change.

But the adjustments are sometimes slow or imperfect. And our standards for the performance of our economy are continually on the rise. No longer will we tolerate widespread involuntary idleness, unnecessary human hardship and misery, the impoverishment of whole areas, the spoiling of our natural heritage, the human and physical ugliness of our cities, the ravages of the business cycle, or the arbitrary redistribution of purchasing power through inflation.

But as our standards for the performance of our economy have risen, so has our ability to cope with our economic problems.

Economic policy has begun to liberate itself from the preconceptions of an earlier day, and from the bitterness of class or partisan division that becloud rational discussion and hamper rational action.

Our tools of economic policy are much better tools than existed a generation ago. We are able to proceed with much greater confidence and flexibility in seeking effective answers to the changing problems of our changing economy.

The accomplishments of the past 4 years are a measure of the constructive response that can be expected from workers, consumers, investors, managers, farmers, and merchants to effective public policies that strive to define and achieve the national interest in—

- Full employment with stable prices;
- Rapid economic growth;
- Balance in our external relationships;
- Maximum efficiency in our public and private economies.

These perennial challenges to economic policy are not fully mastered; but we are well on our way to their solution.

As increasingly we do master them, economic policy can more than ever become the servant of our quest to make American society not only prosperous but progressive, not only affluent but humane, offering not only higher incomes but wider opportunities, its people enjoying not only full employment but fuller lives.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

JANUARY 28, 1965.

REAPPORTIONMENT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has inherited an extraordinary obligation which cannot tolerate delay. Now that the inauguration of the President and Vice President is over and the preliminary business of the new House has largely been accomplished, there are compelling reasons why Congress must act as quickly as possible on the matter of amending the Constitution to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population.

The issue had every reason to be resolved in the 88th Congress and per se is a warning against legislative procrastination that has come to prevail on Capitol Hill during the spring and summer months. The trifling with a question of such significance has already created an atmosphere of confusion in a number of States which sought to comply with the shocking dictate of the Supreme Court and in other States which even now are in the process of attempting to conform without completely destroying the system of representation that has served from the forming of the Constitution.

In its approval of a bill to deprive the Supreme Court of jurisdiction over apportionment of State legislatures, the House last year went on record in support of the philosophy expressed in a vigorous dissent by Justice Potter Stewart, who said that the majority decision "makes unconstitutional the legislatures of most of the 50 States." While this House action offered encouragement to areas of the country which would be deprived of proper representation under the court verdict, failure of the Senate to meet the issue headon during the rush toward adjournment left responsible State authorities in a dilemma of dilatory proportions which today persists in State capitols throughout the Nation.

The House majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], has explained the chaos visited upon his State by the Supreme Court action. After Oklahomans voted overwhelmingly in a referendum for a reapportionment plan for the State legislature, the Supreme Court handed down a decision "telling Oklahomans that the referendum reapportionment plan would not do, regardless of how big it carried in the referendum, regardless apparently if even 100 percent of the people approved it." In his concluding remarks in protest against the Court's action, he said:

My case rests on the unsuitability of having the Federal judiciary superintend legislative apportionments. These apportionments are deeply bound to the traditions of American politics, not of American courts.

Not only does the judiciary lack the means of affording adequate relief to persons aggrieved by the equality of votes standard, it is repugnant to American traditions to allow appointed magistrates to wield such great political power.

I am strongly in favor of action leading to a return of the apportionment power to the people of this country, where it has been since the founding of this country.

I applaud the majority leader for this frank protest. The Court decision on apportionment is not an interpretation of the Constitution; it is an amendment to the Constitution by judicial edict. Nor is there any historical or moral justification for the opinion which holds that State legislatures must have membership based on population alone.

The framers of our Constitution wisely provided for representation in the House of Representatives to be based on population, with geography or State lines the controlling factor in Senate representation. The Supreme Court's notorious decision on apportionment would nullify that concept in State legislatures and would subordinate the interests of less-populated counties and other political districts to the whims and dictates of urban politicians and—ultimately and inevitably—to the whims of big city bosses.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me remind my colleagues that in just 7 years the State legislatures will be charged with the redistricting requirements that shifting populations will bring about through the 1970 census. Left to urban-controlled State legislatures, that redistricting would strip many important geographic and economic entities of a voice in the House of Representatives of the United States as well as in the State houses. I for one do not intend to wait for that day when our rural people are deprived of fit and full representation by what in effect amounts to judicial gerrymandering.

Because of the large number of resolutions that have already been introduced for the purpose of nullifying the Supreme Court's decision on apportionment, I am confident that there will be ample support when the measure comes before the House. But we need to act fast. Already many legislatures in session at the present time are looking to Washington for the protection they need against despoilment of their representative systems. We must not fail them this time.

Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Johnstown, Pa., Tribune-Democrat of January 12, 1965, at the conclusion of my remarks. It commends Governor Scranton for his efforts to have the general assembly of our State undertake to adopt a constitutional amendment. With this demonstration of the feeling among citizens of our land on so vital a subject, I am confident that there will be ample support for our position once Congress takes action.

The editorial follows:

THE CONSTITUTION

Governor Scranton has joined the political leaders of a number of other States in supporting a Federal constitutional amendment on legislative reapportionment. Such an amendment would permit States to apportion one of the two branches of their legislatures on a geographical basis instead of on population alone.

The present Pennsylvania constitution, now ruled unconstitutional by this State's supreme court in line with rulings of the U.S. Supreme Court, requires that each county have one member in the State house of representatives, no matter how small the county. Under the new court rulings, this would not be permitted; nor would Pennsylvania be allowed any longer to limit the number of senators from any single county to one-sixth of the whole.

The senatorial change would not materially alter the State's general assembly, since only one county—Philadelphia—would be affected and it would gain a single seat. But in the house the change would be substantial, since numerous counties fall short of population equal to the average for all of the 67 counties in Pennsylvania. Heretofore each of these has elected its own member of the house.

There are sound reasons for giving each county a representative in the State legislature, since they have problems which are distinct from those of most other counties. And if the purpose of a legislature is to secure a consensus, rather than to obtain special consideration for the politically more powerful counties, it is served by the present system.

Governor Scranton may not be able to persuade the divided general assembly to endorse this proposal, but it just might be that there are enough legislators whose constituents, irrespective of party, want to avoid big-county domination of the State, to get it approved. At least, we hope so.

IMMIGRATION HEARINGS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, all private organizations and interested citizens desiring to take part in the hearings scheduled on immigration legislation are requested to notify the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality in writing on or before February 22, 1965.

As announced yesterday, the hearings will open on February 16, at 10 a.m., with spokesmen from the executive branch of Government who will testify on changes made in the original administration proposal and on which hearings were held during the 88th Congress. Immediately thereafter representatives of private organizations and interested citizens will be scheduled to be heard.

I invite particular attention to the date of February 22, 1965, the date by which all requests to be heard must be filed in writing with the subcommittee.

WORLD'S MOST EXPENSIVE OFFICE BUILDING IS OWNED BY THE TAXPAYERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, two reporters for the Chicago Daily News, Mr. James McCartney and Mr. Charles Nicodemus, have written a most interesting series of articles on the structure known officially as the Rayburn Building in Washington, D.C.

The articles were published in the Daily News last fall after the adjournment of Congress. It is for the reason that they bring together in one place many facts and figures that I offer them for printing in the Record for the benefit of Members of Congress and the public.

It seems impossible that so much money could have been spent on one building to serve so few. It seems impossible, too, that in this day of modern construction it could have taken 10 long years, a full decade, for the construction of an office building.

Many of the reasons for the incredible cost and the time element will be found in the following:

THE WORLD'S MOST EXPENSIVE BUILDING

(By James McCartney and Charles Nicodemus)

(NOTE.—"Mistakes" have run the cost of plush new quarters for Congressmen up, up, and up—to \$95 million.)

(Most of the records of this fantastic Government goof-up are being kept under wraps. And Congressmen are afraid to talk about it.)

(But it's no secret who made 10-percent profit on all the costly mistakes: Matthew H. McCloskey, now under investigation on kickback charges in the Bobby Baker probe.)

WASHINGTON.—This is the untold story of the world's most expensive building—the \$95 million Rayburn Building for Congressmen on Capitol Hill.

It's a story of million-dollar mistakes—and multimillion-dollar miscalculations, of spiraling costs and delays running into the years.

And now, as the building is nearing completion—4 years behind schedule—another long shadow is falling across its marble facade.

It's the shadow of its principal contractor, Matthew H. McCloskey, who is under investigation in the Senate on kickback charges in the reopened Bobby Baker probe.

He has been accused of helping to finance the 1960 Democratic campaign with a tax-free \$35,000 kickback on construction of a new home for the Washington Senators baseball club.

McCloskey's firm has been a beneficiary of mistakes and miscalculations made by the Rayburn Building's planners. McCloskey is a former treasurer of the Democratic National Committee.

From the beginning the Rayburn Building has been in trouble, at least partly because of its opulence. No building in history has provided so much for so few.

It is costing over \$40 million more than the new State Department wing, which has more usable floor space and was started at about the same time. That building—criticized widely as too plush when it opened 4 years ago—cost \$54 million.

Comparisons with other buildings are different because of changing building costs, but for the record the Empire State Building cost \$42 million in 1931 and Chicago's Merchandise Mart \$32 million the same year.

The Empire State Building, tallest in the world, has space for more than 20,000 tenants. The Capitol Architect's Office says the Rayburn Building will house about 2,800 tenants.

In the Rayburn Building, parking space for Congressmen and their aids has cost more than \$10,000 a car.

Office furnishings, at \$10,000 a congressional suite, come to nearly double the tab in outfitting a top Government executive.

Sixty elevator operators will pilot the building's shiny new automatic elevators—while the rest of the Government is engaged in an automation program to save money by getting rid of operators.

The massive building is twice as big as both of the office buildings that have sheltered the entire House of Representatives for the last 30 years.

Yet it will hold only a third of the Members of the House plus nine committees and their staffs.

It has three times the floor space of the Capitol itself.

But perhaps more importantly, the story of the Rayburn Building is a story of a way of life in Congress.

And where McCloskey is involved now, it's a life of fear.

"Go away from me," a veteran Congressman told Daily News reporters inquiring about the Rayburn Building. "I don't want to talk to you."

"I don't want to talk about that building to anybody."

This is a Congress that demands the facts from the executive branch of Government, and then proceeds to hide its own records.

It is a Congress in which powerful politicians operate virtual fiefdoms with public funds—feeling no responsibility to tell the public how public money is spent.

For the records of the Rayburn Building—the checks, the invoices, the vouchers—he in shadows, beyond the reach of public and press.

No outsider can say what the possibilities for payoffs in this shadowy world of politicians and contractors might be.

This is the world on Capitol Hill in which Matthew McCloskey and his firm, McCloskey & Co. of Philadelphia, have competed—and competed well.

In this world, million-dollar contracts mushroom by 50 percent, with a 10-percent profit on the changes.

The McCloskey firm made \$700,000 clear profit on changes in two major Rayburn Building contracts alone—at a time when McCloskey was working overtime as a fundraiser for the Democrats.

Who ordered those changes, and why—and the records of those changes—are matters that congressional leaders prefer to keep to themselves.

At the very least the story of the Rayburn Building provides an object lesson on what can happen when Congress writes a blank check to anyone—but particularly when it writes one to itself.

For the Rayburn Building was a blank check proposition from the day it was born in secrecy in 1955.

And the figures on that blank check have risen over the years on virtually every contract involved.

It all began on the quiet afternoon of March 18, 1955, when Sam Rayburn, the late, great Speaker of the House, unexpectedly took the floor and said, "Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment."

He proposed a \$2 million appropriation, added to a money bill, to build "an additional fireproof office building for the House of Representatives"—plus "such additional sums as may be necessary to carry out this act."

The House at the time had two office buildings, one completed in 1903, the other in 1933. The size of the House of Representatives has not changed in the last 50 years, but staffs and committees have grown.

Speaker Rayburn's proposal was a departure from normal House procedure. No plans had been prepared for the building he

1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1447

July 1, 1967. The bill contains language calling for a study of the ravages of strip-mined land. The study would make recommendations as to how to solve the problem. I completely concur with that part of the bill. But the bill contains a paradox. While the study is being made, money would be authorized for the leveling of private land, I suppose, provided that it would be devoted to public use. My purpose is to make the study first, find out what might be done, and then begin appropriating money for the rehabilitation of land.

AMENDMENT NO. 8

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of my distinguished colleague from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], and myself, I send to the desk a proposed amendment to S. 3. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed and lie on the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 8) was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the amendment would add a new chapter to S. 3, the Appalachia bill, entitled "The Ozark Development Act of 1965."

The amendment would create the Ozark Development Commission, composed of seven members, three appointed by the President from the participating States, three appointed by the Governors of the States, one each from the States of Arkansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma; and the seventh to be appointed at the discretion of the President, to serve as chairman and full-time executive officer of the Commission.

The Commission would provide for the continuing development of comprehensive and coordinated plans and programs, including those for land and public works, and establish priorities therefor; conduct investigations, research, and studies, including inventory and analysis of the resources of the region. The Commission would also sponsor demonstration projects designed to foster regional productivity and growth.

The Commission would prepare detailed plans, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce, for scenic highways in the region, to include planning for the development of recreational sites in such regions.

The Commission would review and recommend modifications or additions to existing Federal, State, local, and private programs to improve their effectiveness, and assist in their financing. It would be authorized to recommend interstate compacts and cooperation; to work with State and local agencies to develop model legislation; support existing local development districts and encourage formation where needed and make grants for professional assistance to these locals; encourage private investment in industrial, commercial, and recreational projects; and to serve as a focal point and coordinating unit for Federal, State, and local programs in the region.

The Commission would provide a meaningful forum for consideration of

problems of the region and propose solutions thereto, using citizens and special advisory councils and public conferences.

The Commission could also designate such other counties in the States covered as deemed necessary to carry out the purposes of the Ozark region legislation; and recommend to the President for transmittal to the Congress a program of development projects, with proposals for Federal participation in their funding as the Commission deems warranted by studies.

The bill would authorize the expenditure of \$7.5 million.

We feel that some areas of our Nation meet the criteria for the proposed development of the Appalachia region, and we in the Ozark area feel that the Ozarks should be included in any program of assistance that is proposed and involved in S. 3.

If we are to have a program of this kind and select areas of our country that are in distress or that are having some economic problems, those of us who are sponsoring the amendment to which I have referred feel that the program should be made applicable to areas and sections of the country in which we are interested and where some of our people live as well as other sections of the Nation. We do not feel that our States and our areas should be discriminated against, omitted, or excluded from the character of the legislation proposed, if it is deemed to be wise and a part of the responsibility of the Federal Government.

AMENDMENT NO. 9

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and myself, I submit and send to the desk an amendment intended to be proposed to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] to S. 3, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed and lie on the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the amendment will lie on the desk.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

On page 4, after line 23, insert the following new subsection:

"(e) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, the Administrator shall designate that portion of the States of Arkansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma as is commonly known as the Ozark region, as a region for the purposes of this Act."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, this is an amendment to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] to S. 3. The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] is designed to assist no more than six economically depressed regions to meet their special problems and to promote their economic development by helping to develop policies and programs for Federal, State, and local efforts essential to an attack upon common problems through a coordinated and concerted regional approach.

His amendment, in essence, is designed to lead to the development of six Appa-

lachia-type regions and starts with the planning, coordinating, developing, and recommending stages.

The amendment we are now submitting to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] would merely specify the Ozark region as one of the six regions to be designated under the proposed legislation. If accepted, it would mean that the Ozark region would qualify for up to \$2½ million for the development of a regional plan for the area.

AMENDMENT NO. 10

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3, surpa, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PREVENT FEDERAL SUBSIDIES FOR CATTLE PRODUCTION IN APPALACHIA (AMENDMENT NO. 11)

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators CURTIS, DOMINICK, MUNDT, TOWER, BENNETT, SIMPSON, MILLER, and LAUSCHE, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to Senate bill 3, the Appalachia bill, which if adopted, will strike section 203 from the Appalachia bill. Section 203 is the section dealing with special assistance to the Appalachia region by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Last year the corresponding section of the bill was entitled "Pasture Improvement and Development." It provided for a direct program of assistance in building up the cattle industry of the region.

In this year's bill as reported by the committee, section 203 is entitled "Land Stabilization, Conservation, and Erosion Control." The new language carefully avoids any mention of pasturage, or of cattle or any other kind of livestock. The language has been completely recast after the model of the Great Plains conservation program and all the emphasis is on conservation.

Last year, section 203 was stricken from the bill by the Senate on the basis of protest from indignant cattlemen all over the country. Although the language has been rewritten, it is suggested that the authority contained in this section should still be a cause for concern by the American cattle industry, and the Senate should stand by its guns and strike it out again.

This position is taken for the following reasons. First of all, the new section 203 still gives to the Secretary of Agriculture all the same authority to make grants to landowners in the amount of the farmers of Appalachia that was contained in the language of section 203 of the bill last year, S. 2782 of the 88th Congress. The bill would authorize grants to landowners in the amount of 80 percent of the cost of the work to be undertaken in conserving and developing the land. In last year's bill, such assistance could be given on not more than 25 acres for each landowner; in this year's bill, the limit has been raised—to 50 acres per landowner.

Last year the Secretary of Agriculture advised us that the only hope of salvation for the farmers of the Appa-

lachie region lay in the development or expansion of cattle production. That was the only real opportunity for improvement in the agricultural productivity of the region. We were told that no other agricultural industry could be expanded to a degree that would be of any real help to those farmers.

If that was the case last year, I see no reason to believe that the situation has changed this year. We must conclude that such improvements as would be accomplished under the provisions of this rewritten section 203 would be mainly in the direction of expanded cattle production.

Thirdly, it is to be noted that exactly the same sum of money, \$17 million, would be authorized in this year's bill as in last year's bill.

Our opposition to this proposal is not due to any lack of sympathy for the problems of the small farmers of the Appalachia region. We understand those problems and would help with them if we could. But we cannot afford to grant discriminatory assistance to the cattle industry of one part of the country at the expense of our own producers. We cannot be expected to acquiesce in a proposal directed squarely against the livelihood of our own people.

Mr. President, surely Senators have not forgotten the uphill struggle of American cattlemen during these past 2 years, to keep their heads above water, to maintain the solvency and the productivity of the American cattle industry. American cattlemen suffered severely from the sharp price declines of 1963 and 1964. Initially, prices of fed cattle dropped as much as 30 percent on the major livestock markets. Choice slaughter steers in Chicago which were over \$30 a hundred in the latter part of 1952, averaged between \$21 and \$22 a hundred during much of last year. Although a part of this price drop has been recovered, it is only a part and prices are still distressingly low.

The plans announced for the Appalachia region were in terms of feeder cattle rather than fat cattle. The picture in this respect is even more depressing. Feeder cattle are still far below the prices even of last year. In Omaha during the week ended January 23, according to the Department of Agriculture, choice feeder steers averaged only \$21.50 per hundred, compared with \$24.25 per hundred at the same time last year.

It would be my hope that whatever action the Senate takes, it will not inflict another blow on the American cattle industry. Last year, the Secretary of Agriculture went up and down the land proclaiming that the problems of the cattle industry were due primarily to our own overproduction. It is inconsistent, in fact it is ridiculous for him to recommend and for us to take action to stimulate further beef production through the use of special Federal subsidies on a basis which discriminates in favor of one section of the country and against all other sections.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF S. 5

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 5, the higher education bill, the name of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] be added as a cosponsor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DESIGNATION OF COLUMBUS DAY AS A LEGAL HOLIDAY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 108) making Columbus Day a legal holiday, the name of the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE] be added as a cosponsor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TO AUTHORIZE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND A PUBLIC COLLEGE OF THE ARTS AND SCIENCES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill, S. 293, authorizing the establishment of a public community college and a public college of arts and sciences in the District of Columbia, the names of my distinguished colleagues, the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] be added as cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A FLOOD CONTROL INSURANCE STUDY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 408, the bill I have introduced to authorize a flood insurance study, the names of Senators MCGEE, HART, JAVITS, and PELL be added as cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REVISION OF OUR IMMIGRATION LAWS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] be added as a cosponsor of S. 500, a bill carrying out the Presi-

dent's recommendations for revision of our immigration laws.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UPPER NIOBRARA RIVER COMPACT, WYOMING AND NEBRASKA—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, a mistake was made as to the sponsors of S. 553. This bill calls for the consent to the Upper Niobrara River Compact between the States of Wyoming and Nebraska.

A similar bill was introduced during the 88th Congress by myself, Senator HRUSKA, Senator CURTIS, and Senator MCGEE. The bill, as introduced on January 15, 1965, should have had the same cosponsors. I ask unanimous consent to have the names of the two Senators from Nebraska and Senator MCGEE added to the bill at the next printing.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of January 19, 1965, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bill and joint resolution:

S. 602. A bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956: Senators ALLOTT, BENNETT, BIBLE, BURDICK, CHURCH, KOCHER, MCGEE, MCGOVERN, MORSE, MUNDT, and SIMPSON.

S.J. Res. 30. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget: Mr. HRUSKA and Mr. THURMOND.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON S. 672, A BILL TO AMEND THE ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Foreign Relations will schedule hearings on February 22, 1965, on S. 672, a bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to increase the authorization for appropriations.

A draft of this bill was transmitted to the Senate by the President of the United States on January 15 and was introduced by me on January 22, 1965. The Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Mr. William C. Foster, will appear on behalf of the administration, and subsequently the committee will hear such others as ask to testify.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 20 U.S.C. 42 and 43, the Speaker had appointed

Speaking Union and asked if he had any message for them. "Yes," he said, "tell them that you bring greetings from an English Speaking Union." And I think that perhaps it was to the relations of the United Kingdom and the United States that he made his finest contribution.

In the last analysis, all the zest and life and confidence of this incomparable man sprang, I believe, not only from the rich endowment of his nature, but also from a profound and simple faith in God. In the prime of his powers, confronted with the apocalyptic risks of annihilation, he said serenely: "I do not believe that God has despaired of his children." In old age, as the honors and excitements faded, his resignation had a touching simplicity: "Only faith in a life after death in a brighter world where dear ones will meet again—only that and the measured tramp of time can give consolation."

The great aristocrat, the beloved leader, the profound historian, the gifted painter, the superb politician, the lord of language, the orator, the wit—yes, and the dedicated bricklayer—behind all of them was the man of simple faith, steadfast in defeat, generous in victory, resigned in age, trusting in a loving providence and committing his achievements and his triumphs to a higher power.

Like the patriarchs of old, he waited on God's judgment and it could be said of him—as of the immortals that went before him—that God "magnified him in the fear of his enemies and with his words he made prodigies to cease. He glorified him in the sight of kings and gave him commandments in the sight of his people. He showed him His glory and sanctified him in his faith."

But file

Ave Maria Endorses President Johnson's Immigration Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record an excellent editorial from the January 30, 1965, issue of Ave Maria, a journal published in my congressional district, in support of President Johnson's proposal for reform of our immigration laws.

The editorial follows:

QUOTA SYSTEM SHOULD GO

During the presidential campaign we heard some bitter talk about changes in immigration policies that would "let down the flood-gates." From our vantage point, we do not see President Johnson's proposals on reform of the immigration laws as doing this at all. They do open the gates to reason and humanity.

Briefly, the reform called for in the President's recent message to Congress would drop the outmoded quota system based on national origins and would base admission on U.S. needs for skills on a first-come-first-served basis. It would give favored treatment to members of separated families. It would restrict immigration from any one country to no more than 10 percent of the total immigration figure but unused quotas (such as England's) could be shifted to another country.

The quota system has always favored the Nordic races. The President's proposal, we

think, would eliminate the discrimination that is implied, in varying degrees, to all other peoples, especially those of dark skin.

The quota system has kept persons of talent and skill from entering the United States. To admit these people would not add to the unemployment problem in our country. Anyone who will look at the "want ad" section of any large city can note numerous openings demanding special skills that cannot be filled now or in the foreseeable future by U.S. citizens presently unemployed.

We believe freedom of movement for all peoples is a value to be guarded and promoted. The President's plan for immigration is not only to our own best interests. It is humane in its application to peoples all over the world.

Allen T. Klots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on New Year's Eve 1964, Allen T. Klots, one of the fine men of New York, quietly passed away after 75 years of activity, energy, and contribution.

I knew Mr. Allen Klots from the time I was a small boy and he was one of those men who provided inspiration for the young people around him. He has had an amazingly broad record of accomplishment.

He was a former president of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, a vigorous advocate of court reform, and a wonderful outdoorsman. He was proficient as a figure skater and as a sailor.

Allen Klots was a member of the law firm of Winthrop, Stimson, Putnam & Roberts in New York City for many years and in 1931 and 1932 had served as assistant to Secretary of State Henry Stimson in Washington. He served on the Mexican border with New York's National Guard and in 1916 he went to France as a lieutenant with the 77th Division of the American Expeditionary Force. After being wounded he became adjutant to Mr. Stimson, then a lieutenant colonel in the 305th Field Artillery Regiment.

Allen Klots had many years of active practice in New York and of service to the community.

The list of Allen Klots' accomplishments would take too many pages to spell out, but a partial summary is contained in the New York Times obituary of Mr. Klots, which follows.

Mr. Speaker, New York and the country has lost a valued citizen.

The obituary follows:

ALLEN T. KLOTS, LAWYER, DIES—FORMER BAR ASSOCIATION HEAD

LAUREL HOLLOW, LONG ISLAND, January 1.—Allen T. Klots, former president of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, a vigorous advocate of court reform and a yachting enthusiast, died of a heart attack in his home here yesterday. He was 75 years old.

Mr. Klots was a member since 1913, and a partner since 1921, of the law firm of Win-

throp, Stimson, Putnam & Roberts, 40 Wall Street.

He served in 1931 and 1932 as a special assistant to Secretary of State Henry L. Stimson. Mr. Klots was a confidant of Mr. Stimson's and served as executor of his estate.

After serving on various bar association committees for many years, Mr. Klots was elected president of the association in 1954 and 1955. During his two terms he was active in urging court reform.

His thorough presentation of the case for overhauling the judicial structure prompted Mayor Wagner to appoint him chairman of the mayor's committee on the courts in 1956. He served in the post for 3 years, laying the groundwork for the eventual reorganization of the city's courts in 1962.

He also served on the bar's steering committee in 1958 in its drive for court reorganization throughout the State. Its efforts were successful and much credit went to Mr. Klots.

Mr. Klots, who was born in Brooklyn, was graduated from Yale in 1909 and from Harvard Law School in 1913, where he was an editor of the Law Review.

CAUGHT STIMSON'S EYE

He joined the firm of Winthrop & Stimson as a clerk, one of many taken on, but his thoroughness caught the eye of Mr. Stimson.

However, Mr. Klots left the firm to join the New York National Guard to serve on the Mexican border. In 1916, he went to France as a lieutenant with the 77th Division of the American Expeditionary Force.

After being wounded slightly 3 times, he was taken on as an adjutant to Mr. Stimson, then a lieutenant colonel in the 305th Field Artillery Regiment.

Mr. Klots stayed in France after the war for a year as a member of the staff of the American Relief Commission in Paris.

When he went back to Mr. Stimson's firm in 1921, he was made a partner.

He followed Mr. Stimson to the State Department as his assistant, and became one of the Secretary's closest advisers.

He accompanied Mr. Stimson to many conferences, including the 1932 General Disarmament Conference in Geneva.

Among Mr. Klots' assignments was the gathering of information on the Soviet Union in preparation for recognition by the United States. Mr. Klots also delved into Asian affairs, including early Japanese aggressions against China.

Though too old for active service in World War II, Mr. Klots lent his 40-foot cutter to the Coast Guard to patrol Long Island Sound. He joined the Coast Guard Auxiliary to serve aboard the cutter on night patrols.

He was an excellent sailor, and won a number of Atlantic Class sloop races in Long Island waters.

Every year he took a month's vacation to sail along the Atlantic coast. Though an arduous undertaking, he maintained this ritual up until last year.

When it was too cold for sailing, he took to skating. His family said he threw himself into the sport with the same fervor he would apply to a court case. In 1960, he was elected president of the Skating Club of New York.

In his spare time, he could be found working on a committee of the Association of the Bar.

In 1948, he headed a committee that urged Congress to adopt reforms of congressional investigating procedures. The resolution was admittedly aimed at the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

In 1955, he declared himself in favor of appointment by the Governor of judges to the State's higher courts after screening by judicial commissions. Mr. Klots said that voters in New York City frequently had to choose among 20-to-35 candidates for judicial office about whom they "know practically nothing."

Mr. Klots, a former mayor of Laurel Hollow, had been a director of Schieffelin & Co., chemical manufacturers and importers of wines and spirits. He was a former treasurer of the New York Law Institute and was a member of Phi Beta Kappa, Delta Kappa Epsilon, Skull and Bones; the Downtown Association and Yale Clubs in New York City; the American Law Institute, the Metropolitan Club in Washington, the Chevy Chase Club in Maryland, the Cold Spring Harbor Beach Club and the Beaver Dam Sports Club in Locust Valley.

Surviving are his widow, Mrs. Mary Isabel FitzBrown Klots; a son, Allen Jr. of New York; a daughter, Mrs. Joan Porter of Laurel Hollow; a sister, Mrs. Constance Fowler of Springfield, Ohio, and two grandchildren.

A funeral service will be held Monday at 11 a.m. in St. John's Episcopal Church, Cold Spring Harbor.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 8½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD is-

sued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. _____ addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time; *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the

lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Aeronautics and Space Administration the sum of \$5,260 million, as follows: (a) for research and development, \$4,575,900,000; (b) for construction of facilities, \$74,700,000; and, (c) for administrative operations, \$609,400,000. Subsection 1(a) for research and development is further subdivided into 23 line items comprising the various NASA research and development programs. Subsection 1(b) for construction of facilities, is further broken down into 13 line items—11 locational, one consisting of a number of projects at various locations, and one for facility planning and design not otherwise provided for.

Subsection 1(d) would authorize the use of appropriations for research and development for: (1) items of a capital nature (other than the acquisition of land) required for the performance of research and development contracts; and, (2) grants to nonprofit institutions of higher education, or to nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research, for purchase or construction of additional research facilities. Title to such facilities shall be vested in the United States unless the Administrator determines that the national program of aeronautical and space activities will best be served by vesting title in any such grantee institution. Moreover, each such grant shall be made under such conditions as the Administrator shall find necessary to insure that the United States will receive therefrom benefit adequate to justify the making of that grant.

In either case no funds may be used for the construction of a facility the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds \$250,000 unless the Administrator notifies specified committees of the Congress of the nature, location, and estimated cost of such facility.

Subsection 1(e) would provide that, when so specified in an appropriation act, (1) any amount appropriated for research and development or for construction of facilities may remain available without fiscal year limitations, and (2) contracts may be entered into under the "Administrative operations" appropriation for maintenance and operation of facilities, and for other services, to be provided during the fiscal year following that for which the appropriation is made.

Subsection 1(f) would authorize the use of not to exceed \$35,000 of administrative operations appropriations for scientific consultations or extraordinary expenses, including representation and official entertainment expenses.

Subsection 1(g) would provide that no funds appropriated pursuant to subsections 1(a) and 1(c) for maintenance, repair, alteration and minor construction may be used to construct any new facility the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds \$100,000.

Subsection 1(h) would provide that, when so specified in an appropriation act, any appropriation authorized under this act to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration may initially be used, during the fiscal year 1966, to finance work or activities for which funds have been provided in any other appropriation available to the Administration and appropriate adjustments between such appropriations shall subsequently be made in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

SECTION 2

Section 2 would authorize the 5-percent upward variation of any of the sums authorized for the construction of facilities line items (other than facility planning and design) when, in the discretion of the Administrator, this is needed to meet unusual cost variations. However, the total cost of all work authorized under these line items may not exceed the total sum authorized for construction of facilities under subsection 1(b), paragraphs (1) through (12).

Section 3 would provide that not more than 2 percent of the funds appropriated for research and development, may be transferred to the construction of facilities appropriation and, when so transferred, together with \$30 million of the funds appropriated for construction of facilities, shall be available for the construction of facilities and land acquisition at any location if (1) the Administrator determines that such action is necessary because of changes in the space program or new scientific or engineering developments, and that deferral of such action until the next authorization act is enacted would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities. However, no such funds may be obligated until 30 days have passed after the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to specified committees of Congress a written report containing a description of the project, its cost, and the reason why such project is necessary in the national interest, or such committee before the expiration of such 30-day period has notified the Administrator that no objection to the proposed action will be made.

SECTION 4

Section 4 provides that, notwithstanding any other provision of this act—

(1) No amount appropriated pursuant to this act may be used for any program deleted by the Congress from requests as originally made to either the House Committee on Science and Astronautics or the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences;

(2) No amount appropriated pursuant to this act may be used for any program in excess of the amount actually authorized for that particular program by subsections 1(a) and 1(c); and

(3) No amount appropriated pursuant to this act may be used for any program which has not been presented to or requested of either such committee,

unless (A) a period of 30 days has passed after the receipt by each such committee of notice given by the Administrator or his designee containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of such proposed action, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

SECTION 5

Section 5 would provide that the act may be cited as the "National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1966."

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I also introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 212(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The Immigration and Nationality Act now requires that a foreign exchange student reside abroad for 2 years before he or she is eligible to apply for U.S. citizenship, with certain provisions for hardship cases. It does not, however, allow a foreign exchange student to remain here under normal circumstances even when the student's own government has no objection.

The bill which I introduce would amend the Immigration and Nationality

Act, to provide that the Attorney General may waive the requirement of a 2-year residence abroad for foreign exchange students when the government of the student's country files written notification that it has no objection, and the Attorney General finds that the student's admission to the United States would be in the public interest.

I see no valid reason why a person should be required to leave this country for 2 years if it is in the public interest for him to remain here and his own government has no objection to his doing so. I hope that the Congress will see fit to change the law in this respect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 929) to amend section 212 (e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN EXCISE TAXES

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two excise tax bills. Early in the 88th Congress I introduced S. 154, to repeal the excise tax on luggage, handbags, and similar items. Senators will recall that the Senate adopted an amendment to the Excise Tax Rate Extension Act of 1964 which included a repeal of that particular tax. I was greatly gratified by the action which the Senate took on that occasion, but the action did not stand; the amendment was dropped by the conference committee, and the bill as finally adopted by both bodies did not repeal the tax.

Nevertheless, I was heartened by the Senate action, and I believe that the Senate as a whole is convinced now of the inequity of continuing that particular tax. Today I reintroduce the measure to repeal the tax on luggage and similar items, in the confident expectation that in this Congress the wisdom of the Senate will finally prevail.

Included in the amendment to the 1964 excise tax bill, in addition to luggage and other leather goods, were cosmetics and the first \$100 of the sales price on furs and jewelry. I was convinced last year that the Senate was right in repealing all those taxes, and I therefore submit a bill which would accomplish that purpose. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the table for 1 week to allow other Senators to join as cosponsors, if they so desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

The bills, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

S. 930. A bill to repeal the retailers excise tax on luggage, handbags, and similar items; and

S. 931. A bill to repeal or limit certain retailers excise taxes.

**DETERMINATION OF BOUNDARIES
OF UTE MOUNTAIN AND NAVAJO
RESERVATIONS**

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the bill I introduce today passed the Senate on October 22, 1963, but failed to receive final committee action in the House of Representatives prior to adjournment of the 88th Congress on October 3, 1964.

The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Ute Mountain Tribe or the Navajo Tribe to commence litigation in a three-judge district court to determine the location of a part of the common boundary between their two reservations. The situs of the disputed boundary is in northwestern New Mexico, and the bill appropriately specifies the U.S. District Court of the District of New Mexico as the judicial forum, and authorizes a direct right of appeal to the Supreme Court. I believe that the three-judge district court is the appropriate judicial vehicle in this instance since the dispute will call into question the treaty of June 1, 1868—15 Stat. 667—and a Federal statute—28 Stat. 677, February 20, 1895.

It seems that the boundaries established by the treaty and the statute overlapped; however, the dispute did not become active until recent years when oil and gas was discovered in the area and indeed under the very lands in controversy—a strip of land 2 miles wide and 10½ miles long. The Navajo boundary, as established by the 1868 treaty, was surveyed and monumented in the following year, but the monuments cannot now be located.

In order that mineral development could continue in this area, the Navajo and the Ute Mountain Tribes entered into an agreement on May 9, 1957, which had the approval of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The agreement permitted joint leasing of the area with the revenues deposited in a joint account pending the resolution of the dispute. Due to the leasing pattern in the area, the joint account agreement also includes an area 2 miles wide on each side of the disputed strip. Therefore, two-thirds of the lands subject to this agreement are outside the disputed strip, and two-thirds of the funds in the joint account are not subject to dispute.

Several million dollars have accumulated in the joint account, dollars that might better be used to further the development of the respective tribal educational and industrial projects. It is my sincere hope that the Congress will act quickly on this legislation so that the matter may progress toward an early and final judicial resolution. The parties are anxious for the settlement of the matter, and the Congress should be equally anxious to provide the means whereby the dispute may be settled.

On behalf of Senators DOMINICK, ANDERSON, and myself, I send the bill to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred, and that the bill lie on the desk for the remainder of the week so that other Senators who wish to join in sponsoring this bill may do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill

will lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

The bill (S. 933) to determine the rights and interests of the Navajo Tribe and the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation in and to certain lands in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

**DEDUCTION FROM GROSS INCOME
FOR WATER ASSESSMENTS**

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I introduce a bill which would allow farmers to deduct as expense all amounts paid to irrigation ditch companies or similar entities for water assessments. This bill is prompted by the position taken by the Internal Revenue Service last year when its agents were auditing 1963 returns. I received letters from several of my constituents saying that the IRS had departed from its prior practice, and was disallowing portions of the water assessments.

The mutual ditch company is a legal entity which was first introduced in our Western States. It is largely unknown and little understood east of the Missouri River. It may take any one of several forms, but basically it is organized simply as a means of conveying irrigation water from the point of diversion on a stream to the final user, the farmer who irrigates his land. The company or association will hold naked legal title to the diversion works and canals. The shareholders of the association are entitled to water in proportion to their stockholdings, and the shares of stock in such companies have often been held in Colorado to be real property. The company may make assessments against the shares of stock, and unless those assessments are paid in full, the owner thereof is not entitled to receive water from the ditches of the company. Further, the assessments become a lien against the stock, and thus against the water rights represented thereby, and if the assessments continue unpaid, the stock may be sold by such association to enable it to recover the amount of such assessments.

Internal Revenue agents, from what I have been told, have not all treated these assessments in the same way, and there seems to be some question whether certain portions of the assessment should or should not be deductible. The great bulk of the assessments, however, are for operation and maintenance of the canal and reservoir systems. The bill which I introduce today, Mr. President, would clarify the situation and provide even-handed treatment to all farmers who must irrigate their lands. It is my sincere hope that the Senate will be able to adopt this measure in this Congress, perhaps as an amendment to a House-passed revenue measure.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the table for 1 week to allow Senators to join as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill

will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

The bill (S. 934) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a farmer a deduction from gross income for water assessments levied by irrigation ditch companies introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

**HOOVER DAM POWERPLANT
DEFICIENCIES**

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, it has truly been said: "The mill cannot grind with the water that is past." The truth of this statement was apparent to delegations of the Upper Colorado River Basin States, and the Secretary of the Interior took heed of it on May 11, 1964, when he announced the closing of the gates at Glen Canyon Dam in Arizona, marking the termination of the misappropriation of Colorado River water belonging to the upper basin.

At that time, Lake Mead, behind Hoover Dam, was quite low, primarily as a result of allowing water far in excess of downstream entitlements to pass over the dam for power production purposes. To make the announcement more palatable to the lower basin, the Secretary also announced his intention to charge the upper basin fund with the cost of furnishing deficiency power to Hoover Dam power contractors; but the Secretary failed to indicate the source in law of this claimed authority to make such an arbitrary decision.

If the upper basin were withholding water beyond its legal entitlement, there might be some basis for the charge to the upper basin in equity, if not in law. But, during the past 10 years the upper basin has already delivered to the lower basin approximately 20 million acre-feet of water in excess of its legal obligation under the Colorado River Compact. What kind of justice would require the upper basin to pay for the privilege of keeping what lawfully belongs to it? The injustice of it is doubly apparent when one realizes that the water retained behind Glen Canyon Dam will turn its generators and produce revenues for the repayment of the Federal investment at Glen Canyon and will later be available downstream to turn the generators at Hoover Dam. Naturally, generators had to be installed at Glen Canyon Dam and a minimum power pool had to be established before we could commence producing power at two locations on the river with the same water, and it was the minimum power pool that the upper basin was fighting for. A delay in establishing this minimum power pool meant a delay in reaping the benefit of double beneficial use of the water. The bill I introduce today is designed to help relieve the upper basin of this unfair and oppressive burden. It will spread the cost between both the upper basin and the lower basin, and this is fair since Glen Canyon Dam spreads its benefits to both basins. In addition to receiving power generated at Glen Canyon Dam, the lower basin is

1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

1611

year as were enrolled 10 years ago. If projections prove correct, the present figure of 4.8 million students will rise to 6.9 million by 1970. There have been three main aspects of this upsurge in higher education enrollments: more students compete for the scholarship and loan assistance available at each college, more students compete for the part-time jobs available on or near each campus, and more students are being drawn from middle- and low-income families.

It is in the national interest that more of the country's young people have the opportunity to acquire better training and education. In a practical sense, opportunity comes in three forms: scholarships, loans, and work-study programs.

The present average cost for attending a public college or university for 1 year is \$1,560 and for attending a private institution, \$2,370. This is up from the \$1,190 and \$1,700 respectively in 1954-55. It is currently estimated that by 1970 the cost of attending a public institution for 1 year will reach \$1,840 and for attending a private institution \$2,780. Sums of this magnitude inevitably discourage many worthy young men and women of low-income families from pursuing their education after high school.

In 1960, there were 1,079,000 high school graduates who did not go on to college. Forty-two percent indicated that finances played a role in their decision not to go; of these, nearly half flatly said they could not afford to consider college at all. Thus, some 217,000 high school graduates who would have liked to have continued their education were prevented from doing so by financial inability. Of the number of young people who did go on to higher education, 22 percent dropped out by the end of the first year. Of these, 28 percent gave lack of money as the prime reason for dropping out.

These statistics are chiefly an expression of the plight of low-income families and their children. The relationship between family income and college attendance is clear: in 1960, for example, 78 percent of all high school graduates whose families had incomes of \$12,000 or more per year went on to college. By contrast, only 33 percent of students in the \$3,000-or-less family income bracket went on to higher education.

The problem of financing higher education is not limited to low-income families. Families of average income trying to provide a college education for their children also face a serious situation. The most serious difficulty occurs for such middle-income families when there are two or more children attending college at one time. Upon the enrollment of the oldest child as a college freshman, the family commits a large part of its resources to education for an extended period of time. When the second child arrives as a college freshman, expenditures double, and the family must meet costs of \$5,000 or more a school year.

Students from middle-income families often find it difficult to obtain financial relief. The family's income may be too high for them to qualify for many scholarship or loan programs; but insufficient to carry the full burden of support for children in college. In addition, interest rates on loans are often too high to permit middle-income families to make long-term commitments. That the pinch is already being felt can be seen in the fact that three out of every four families now taking part in some kind of federally supported student loan program have brothers and sisters of college age.

Existing loan programs are under strong pressures with more than 600,000 students having borrowed approximately \$453 million from the national defense student loan funds set up in 1,574 colleges and universities. Before the enactment of this program in 1958, most institutions of higher education had

never made a student loan; not more than 100 institutions had loan programs that totaled more than a few thousands of dollars annually. Today, rising numbers of students are asking for the aid of this program to help them stay in school; in addition, new colleges are being created—500 new institutions in the past 18 years—and each one is a potential subscriber to the NDSL program, requiring the Federal contribution. The 88th Congress, recognizing the increasing pressures on these federally supported student loan funds, authorized \$163.3 million for the current fiscal year, \$179.3 million for fiscal 1966, \$190 million for fiscal 1967, and \$195 million for fiscal 1968.

The third method of assisting needy students in colleges and universities is by making available to them part-time employment. College-paid undergraduate employment now totals about \$145 million a year and provides 425,000 students with average earnings of \$350 a year each. The work-study program of the Economic Opportunities Act of 1964 is underway with present grants to institutions totaling \$71 million annually; but there is also much evidence that this is insufficient support to meet the demands of work needed by students, particularly those students from families of low income.

Proposal

Title IV proposes a 5-year program of student financial aid to make the benefits of higher education available to academically qualified students in need of financial assistance. The title provides four types of assistance: (1) undergraduate scholarships to qualified high school graduates from low-income families; (2) insured reduced-interest private loans to both undergraduate and graduate students through approved commercial lenders and certain State and non-profit programs; (3) an expanded work-study program to provide part-time employment; and (4) extension and expansion of the National Defense Student Loan Program.

(a) Undergraduate scholarships:

The undergraduate scholarship program would provide grants of up to \$800 per academic year for qualified high school graduates from low-income families. A student may receive the scholarship on an annual basis for a period of up to 4 years while pursuing a full-time undergraduate course of study at an eligible institution of higher education. It is not intended that this scholarship would be the sole financial support of the recipient. Loans under the National Defense Education Act and work-study opportunities could be combined in such a manner as to provide appropriate financial assistance—dependent upon the need and capabilities of each student.

In order for the student to qualify for the scholarship, he must be under 21; must be from a low-income family; must be capable of maintaining good standing at an institution of higher education; must have been accepted as a full-time student; and must have made application demonstrating his need for financial assistance. The selection of recipients would be made by the institution in which the student was enrolled. Preference would be given to students entering upon their freshman year and to students entering 4-year schools after have been graduated from 2-year institutions of higher education. In determining whether a student is from a low-income family or not, the institution would make an appropriate review of the student's entire financial status.

The amount of a scholarship would be determined by the institution on the basis of criteria or schedules provided by the Commissioner of Education. The scholarship could not exceed \$800, nor could it exceed the cost of the student's education.

Student scholarships would be provided through institutions of higher education

which have made agreements with the Commissioner. Institutions eligible would be those which have in operation agreements for loans under the National Defense Education Act and for employment under the college work-study program.

The Commissioner of Education would make an agreement with an institution of higher learning requiring the institution to make vigorous efforts to identify qualified youths from low-income groups and encourage them to continue their education beyond secondary school. Colleges would establish close working relationships with secondary schools and could make tentative commitments of scholarships to qualified students enrolled in grade 11 or lower and to secondary school dropouts. Up to 5 percent of the funds received could be spent by the institutions for the administrative costs involved in this identification and encouragement program. An institution would also be required to maintain its efforts in its own scholarship and loan program.

Scholarship funds would be apportioned among the States in the following manner:

1. One-third on the basis of the number of full-time students enrolled in institutions of higher education in each State in relation to the total number of such students;

2. One-third on the basis of the portion of secondary school graduates in each State; and

3. One-third on the basis of the portion of children under age 18 from families with annual incomes of less than \$3,000.

Up to 2 percent of the total appropriations could be allocated to Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

It is also provided that the Commissioner could enter into contracts, not to exceed \$100,000 per year, with State and local educational agencies and other public or non-profit organizations for the purpose of (1) identifying qualified youths from low-income families and encouraging them to continue their education, (2) publicizing existing forms of financial aid, and (3) encouraging secondary school dropouts to re-enter educational programs.

The first-year authorization would be \$70 million.

(b) Insured reduced-interest loans:

Insured, reduced-interest student loans would be provided by the establishment of the student loan insurance fund which would enable the Commissioner to insure eligible lenders against losses on loans made by them to students in eligible institutions who do not have reasonable access to similar loan programs. It is also provided that the Commissioner would pay a portion of the interest (up to 2 percentage points) on such loans and on certain other loans which are insured under a State program or by a nonprofit private organization or institution.

Students would be able to borrow up to \$1,500 annually in order to pursue a course of study at an eligible institution. The aggregate insured unpaid principal amount could not exceed \$9,000 in the case of a graduate or professional student or \$6,000 in the case of any other student. The maximum amount of interest paid by the borrower would be set by the Secretary on a national, regional, or other appropriate basis.

Repayment of the loans would begin 1 year after the student ceases to carry at least one-half of a normal full-time workload or course of study. The period of repayment could not exceed 10 years and the complete term of the loan could not exceed 15 years.

A student would be eligible to obtain an insured loan if he (1) has been accepted for enrollment at an eligible institution; (2) if he carries at least one-half of a normal full-time workload; or (3) if he is already en-

February 1

rolled at an eligible institution and maintains good standing.

Eligible institutions in this program would be (1) institutions of higher education which are fully accredited and which offer courses creditable toward a bachelor's degree; or, (2) business, vocational, and technical schools which are accredited and which admit only students who have completed or left secondary school. A student could borrow from an eligible institution of higher education or from any participating commercial lender which is subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or any State.

The total principal amount of new loans to students covered by insurance would not exceed \$700 million in fiscal year 1966, \$1 billion in fiscal year 1967, and \$1.4 billion in fiscal year 1968 and each of the two succeeding fiscal years.

First-year cost would be \$15 million.

(c) College work-study program extension and amendments:

The work-study program under part C of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 would be transferred from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education.

This program provides for contracts between the Commissioner of Education and institutions of higher education in which part-time employment opportunities are encouraged. The proposed amendments would expand the opportunities for part-time employment particularly for students from low-income families.

The period during which the Federal share of the compensation of students employed may not exceed 90 percent would be extended for 1 year, through June 30, 1967.

Authorization for fiscal year 1966 would be \$129 million. Of this amount \$84 million is carried in the budget requests for the Office of Economic Opportunity, \$45 million for the Office of Education.

(d) Extension of national defense student loan program:

Title IV-D would extend the authorization of the National Defense Student Loan Program (title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, as amended) for an additional 3 years with the following authorizations: \$225 million for fiscal year 1969, \$250 million for fiscal year 1970, \$275 million for fiscal year 1971.

STATE TECHNICAL SERVICES ACT OF 1965

(Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Madam Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to promote economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise. Its proposed title is the State Technical Services Act of 1965. A similar bill was introduced on January 25 by the Honorable OREN HARRIS, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, as part of the President's program.

My State of California, and indeed the entire Nation, has a profound and justified interest in using the results of our modern science and technology for the benefit of the people and our businesses and industries. The bill would give grants to States in support of plans for infusing existing scientific and technological information into the lifestream

of our civilian economy, thus helping to create more jobs, enhance industrial development and improve the means for making this knowledge more readily available to businesses, both small and large.

At a time when military expenditures are leveling off, it is imperative that we find ways to encourage free enterprise to use science for the vast segment of the economy, not related to the space or defense mission. The provisions of this bill could be of invaluable assistance in this respect.

The Department of Commerce, which developed the proposal, is to be congratulated for its foresight in identifying and seeking to remedy this imbalance in our uses of science and engineering information. I am particularly impressed that the administration has recognized the essential need for universities to be actively engaged in furnishing this science and engineering information for the benefit of our commerce and industry.

REALISTIC, HUMANE IMMIGRATION POLICY IS LONG OVERDUE

(Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Madam Speaker, as in the past, I am proud to join in the sponsorship of legislation to bring immigration policy in line with the inscription beneath the Statue of Liberty proclaiming to all nations, "Give me your tired, your poor; your huddled masses yearning to breathe free."

I am not, however, proud that it is necessary to introduce remedial legislation every session. Substantive changes in our immigration law should have moved through the U.S. Congress many years ago.

When President Truman vetoed the Immigration Act of 1952—known as the McCarran-Walter Act—he was, in fact, vetoing racism and injustice as landmarks of American thinking.

This law, unfortunately upheld by Congress, actually is a codification of all the restrictive immigration enactments of previous years, compounded by many new and severer restrictions and injustices under the soporific excuse of national security.

The words of President Truman in his veto message still remain a correct indictment of the 1952 restrictive, racist immigration law; that is, the law "discriminates, deliberately and intentionally against many peoples of the world."

Then 2 years later we heard the late, great Senator Herbert Lehman put it on the line when he stated:

The system presupposes that persons born in one country are better suited to immigrate here and become American citizens than persons born in another. As reflected in our immigration quotas, an individual born in Britain is presumed to be 13 times more acceptable to America than one born in Italy and 200 times more acceptable than one born in Greece.

This assumption is not only utterly false on the face of it; it is basically repulsive to

the very spirit and tradition—to the meaning—of America.

And just a short time ago, Madam Speaker, we were privileged to hear in this Chamber, President Johnson in his state of the Union message, declaring, "We must open opportunities to all our people," including "to those in other lands that are seeking the promise of America, through an immigration law based on the work a man can do and not where he was born or how he spells his name."

I fully agree with the President's goal. In short, I respectfully submit that our immigration law should not be based on a national quota system, but based on a person's need, talent, and above all, our commitment to democratic concepts in judging others. I would hope that the pending immigration legislation, in line with this administration's objectives, would be a priority item for this Congress.

Madam Speaker, may I jog our collective national memory for just a moment by pointing out that way back in 1787, during the Constitutional Convention, James Madison said:

That part of America which has encouraged them [the foreigners] has advanced more rapidly in population, agriculture, and the "art."

History has proved him right and we in Congress have an obligation to go along with the healthy tide of history by repealing the 1952 discriminatory immigration act as part of the law of the land.

FIFTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

(Mr. NATCHER (at the request of Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. NATCHER. Madam Speaker, the week of February 7 through February 13 commemorates the 55th anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America. In our present-day society, when from all sides, we hear voices raised in concern against the rising tide of discontent that seems to affect so many of our young people, it is pleasant and somehow reassuring to take notice of this fine and upstanding group of young men and boys, each of whom has pledged himself to the betterment of the world he lives in, with this simple oath:

On my honor I will do my best; to do my duty to God and my country, and to obey the Scout law; to help other people at all times; to keep myself physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight.

The Boy Scouts of America was incorporated on February 8, 1910, and the organization was granted a charter by the Congress on June 15, 1916, with the President of the United States as honorary president. Since 1910, 36 million American youths have become members. Since 1910, 36 million American youths have become better Americans.

Today, the national membership stands at 4 million boys and 1,500,000 adults. Today, in Cub packs, Scouting groups

that the name of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] be added as a co-sponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 35) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote in presidential elections.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

Article entitled "The Kids of Wrangell," written by Joan Davidson, and published in the Reporter for November 5, 1964.

By Mr. COOPER:

Article entitled "Kentucky Power Lights Up Ecuador," written by Ernest L. Clark, and published in the December 27, 1964, issue of the Louisville Courier-Journal.

Article on Joshua B. Everett, of Louisville, Ky., published in the Louisville Times of December 26, 1964.

SUPPORT OF TEXAS RIGHT-TO-WORK LAW—RESOLUTION OF SAN ANTONIO MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, on January 19 the board of directors of the San Antonio Manufacturers Association unanimously passed a resolution setting forth in no uncertain terms their support of the Texas State right-to-work law and expressing strong opposition to any national moves to invalidate that law which Texans freely adopted by majority vote.

I am in complete agreement with the views of the board, and I ask that their resolution be printed at this point in the Record so that other Senators may consider the depth of Texas conviction on this issue.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY SAN ANTONIO MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION PERTAINING TO OFFICIAL ASSOCIATION POLICY REGARDING LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS TOWARD THE REPEAL OF THE RIGHT-TO-WORK LAW

Whereas President Lyndon Baines Johnson, in his state of the Union message, on January 4, 1965, called on Congress to enact legislation for the repeal of section 14-B of the Taft-Hartley Act; and

Whereas it is most evident that any legislative action repealing said section 14-B would be the Government's denial to the American worker his freedom of choice and freedom of action; and

Whereas section 14-B does not in any manner injure nor destroy the rights of union workers or unions themselves; but, guarantees the rights to organize and the rights to belong as union members to the individual; and

Whereas section 14-B upholds and protects a great basic American freedom to the extent that freedom of individual action and personal conviction is recognized as being a valuable citizen right, in that this section 14-B reads:

"Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State or Territory in which such execution or application is prohibited by State or Territorial law;" and

Whereas we note with pride on one hand that antidiscrimination is now the law of the land; and, then, on the other hand, find that a great discrimination is asked as a law of the land against American labor in the repeal of the right to work law; and

Whereas the officers, board of directors, and the general membership of the San Antonio Manufacturers Association hold high the belief that the repeal of section 14-B of the Taft-Hartley Act, would be the destructive element of democracy for States rights; and, most of all, the rights of the individual; and

Whereas we strongly believe and hold the conviction that a serious matter of this nature deserves the entire American citizenry's rights to voice their decisions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That on January 19, 1965, the board of directors of the San Antonio Manufacturers Association, in official board meeting held in San Antonio, the above date, unanimously adopts this resolution of policy which reflects and clearly states "opposition and objections in unanimous voice to any legislative programs calling for the repeal of section 14-B of the Taft-Hartley Act.

LESTER J. FERGUSON,

President, San Antonio Manufacturers Association.

BILL E. HENDERSON,

Executive Secretary, San Antonio Manufacturers Association.

THE JOHNSON BEGINNING

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Walter Lippmann writes with his usual brilliance in this morning's edition of the Washington Post. His column, entitled "The Johnson Beginning," is worthy of the highest praise. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE JOHNSON BEGINNING

(By Walter Lippmann)

Seen from the sidelines, it has been particularly impressive to note how the beginning of the Johnson administration has been marked by a change of emphasis and direction. For the first time in the 25 years since the start of the Second World War, the main attention of the President is not fixed upon the dangers abroad but on the problems and the prospects at home.

It will be a great mistake, I am sure, to read this as meaning that the country is withdrawing into isolation, having lost interest in the world abroad. What has happened is that there is for the time being a conjuncture of events abroad which makes it safe and prudent for the country to abate its anxiety and to pay attention to its own affairs. For these affairs have been sacrificed and grievously neglected for a quarter of a century.

The President's budget and his messages compose, it seems to me, a brilliantly contrived and integrated program for initiating those progressive reforms which are at once necessary and practicable. Read as a whole, the collection of messages shows the President to be a bold innovator, who is likely to succeed because he is deeply in touch with the great central mass of American sentiment and opinion. We have rarely, if ever, seen at the beginning of a new administration such a coherent program, such in-

sight and resourcefulness. The President has grasped the nettle of race relations, of the church and state controversy, of business confidence and the welfare state, with a sure and skillful hand.

There is an international context for the explicit Johnson program. Though the President did not talk about it because it is not ripe to be talked about from his office, the State of the world today permits and justifies the preoccupation with American domestic affairs. I do not, of course, presume to know or to say how the President—if he were given to generalization and speculation, which he isn't—would describe the state of world affairs which is implied in his policies and program. But the state of the world can be described somewhat as follows:

The postwar period which has lasted for 20 years has kept us all preoccupied with the unfinished business of the World War. It has not been possible to make a settlement of that war, either in Europe where Germany and the Continent are partitioned, or in Eastern Asia where Korea, China, and Indochina are partitioned and Japan is separated from the Ryukyus. This postwar period is now ending. The period we have entered upon is already plainly visible in Europe and, quite dimly, it is just beginning to appear in East Asia. This post-postwar period will see a general movement toward that settlement of the Second World War.

The hard core of the settlement will be the inevitable return to normal after the convulsions which the World War produced. Thus, in Europe, the collapse of Hitler's Nazi empire brought the Russians to the Elbe River in the middle of Europe. The Soviet tide will have to recede. In fact, it has quite visibly already begun to recede. In East Asia, the collapse of the Japanese empire brought the United States to the Asian mainland and to some of the islands off its shores. This is an extension of our political power beyond its normal and natural limits, and like the Russians in Europe, the American tide will have to recede.

It is as abnormal for the United States to be in Seoul, in Okinawa, in Quemoy and Matsu and Formosa, in Saigon and Hue as it is abnormal for the Russians to be in Berlin, Warsaw, Prague, Budapest, Bucharest, and Sofia. The settlement of the World War, which must come someday, is certain to mean correction of the great displacements of power—of the Russian power into the heart of Europe and of American power onto the mainland of Asia.

The historical reality cannot be understood in terms of battles which are won or lost. The whole historical process is more like a geological phenomenon, like the subsiding of the earth and the return of the waters after a great upheaval. It is a callow kind of jingoism to talk of victory for us and defeat for the Soviet Union as it accommodates itself to the growing intercourse between the two halves of Europe. And it is panic-mongering to flagellate ourselves into paroxysms of anguish and shame at the prospect of negotiating settlements which end our entanglements in East Asia.

The role of the United States in the world today is to use its power, its resources, its brains, and its experience to see that this inevitable readjustment in Europe and Asia comes to pass decently and honorably. The time has come to stop imagining ourselves to be the "leader" of Europe. The time has come to stop beating our heads against stone walls under the illusion that we have been appointed policeman to the human race.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL TRAINING AN AID TO WORLD PEACE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, one of the agencies of Government which has attracted my attention and admiration

1574

for many years is the present International Agricultural Development Service—the agency which used to be the Foreign Agricultural Service—and its foreign agricultural training activities.

One of the great concepts which our Nation has adopted is that we can help to ease international tensions by easing economic distress, reducing illiteracy, and providing means for nations to help themselves. We are doing this through an exchange of knowledge in many areas, but we are doing especially well through the programs developed by foreign agricultural training.

Robert Ulrich in his book, "Education and the Idea of Mankind," said:

Good education . . . is not only a process of information. It is also an endeavor to help a person respect honest differences of opinion and discover his capacity for continuous growth through enriching experiences.

I believe that is precisely the type of education and training which is done by this agency of Government.

For the past 3 years, I have consulted with Cannon Hearne and others who share the responsibility for outlining these training programs. I have come to admire them for their dedication. Through their good offices, we have co-operated in bringing two great international training seminars to the campus of South Dakota State University at Brookings, S. Dak. In 1962 we had an international seminar on soil and water, which was an outstanding success. This summer, we expect to hold another such seminar covering the role of extension work and rural youth programs. We anticipate that it will also be a resounding success.

The foreign agricultural training division has just issued its annual report. As I glanced through it, I was inspired by the information it contained, as well as the challenges it presented for itself. I think the work of the agency is well set out in the following statement:

A PROGRAM FOR A BETTER FUTURE

Benefits of this international sharing of U.S. agricultural technology will be reaped for many years to come. This is a constructive and humanitarian effort in building a better world for all men which is in keeping with U.S. foreign policy and the American tradition. In many countries, this educational program is the foundation for hopes of adequate food and better nutrition in the near future. And, because agriculture is the number one industry in most developing nations, this assistance is vital to their economic growth and fuller participation in world trade.

Believing that others may be interested in the work and success of this agency, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record selected excerpts of its annual report.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The United States, for over 20 years, has helped developing nations of the free world improve their agriculture and rural life. This has been done through (1) technical assistance—sending U.S. technicians to advise on steps for development—and (2) training—bringing to this country specialists in

agriculture to study our agricultural methods firsthand.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture's part in this program is coordinated by the International Agricultural Development Service. IADS, established as a USDA agency in August of 1963, works with the other agencies of the Department in sending abroad USDA specialists to serve in the developing countries. This work is conducted for the Agency for International Development in much the same way as many U.S. universities are helping AID establish new universities in Latin America, Africa, and Asia. In 1964, teams of USDA technicians provided technical assistance in El Salvador, Ecuador, Bolivia, Colombia, Tunisia, and Algeria.

Training is coordinated by the foreign training division, a division of IADS. The foreign training division helps plan, schedule, supervise and evaluate programs for agriculturists sent to this country for training. It maintains close relationships with universities, associations, and agricultural businesses that can train individuals with needs for specialized skills and knowledge.

Cooperatively, the Department of Agriculture is working with the entire U.S. agricultural community—universities, organizations, businesses, farmers—to provide the best technical assistance and training possible.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL TRAINING, 1964

In the past year, 3,541 individuals from other countries arrived in the United States for training in agriculture. Another 1,009 remained in this country to continue agricultural training they had started the year before. These individuals are professional agricultural specialists from other countries, who have come to the United States to learn new skills and knowledge which will enable them to improve agricultural production and rural living at home.

Training for these people was planned and directed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Some training actually was conducted by the Department's various agencies. But most of it was provided by land-grant universities, farm organizations, agricultural businesses and other cooperating groups. The training often took unusual turns—from college classes in bee culture in Georgia for a man from Jordan to practice in making educational motion pictures in California for a man from Sudan—training for a specific individual's technical needs so that he might perform a job in his country more effectively on his return.

The participant

The individual agriculturist, when he arrives in this country under sponsorship of AID or an international organization, is called a participant. This term is used because he participates in the educational program which has been planned for him. The Department and cooperating institutions have made available to him training opportunities. But success or failure of the program depends on him, on his participation.

The term "participant" is used also because these individuals already are professionals. Thus they are neither students nor trainees. For the most part, they have had considerable academic training and numerous years of experience in their fields of specialization. They are among the most talented agriculturists in their country. On them rests their country's hopes for progress and development in the future.

Participants are picked for training in the United States with care and consideration. In almost every case, they are selected co-operatively by their own governments and a U.S. technician, usually an AID adviser, working in their country. The American technician, in fact, normally has worked directly with them and thus knows their specific training needs, their capabilities,

and the part they are likely to play in the future development of their country. Participants therefore, come with certain training needs in mind which, if filled, will make them more effective in their jobs when they return. This U.S. training also helps them understand guidance offered by the American technician with whom they are working. Others benefit from their training, too, for in most cases participants help train their countrymen who are not able to come to the United States.

Participants come as individuals and in groups. They come at various times of the year and for different periods. Virtually all come for practical experience and know-how. A few attend college courses.

Most training in 1964 was either practical, or academic, or a combination. For a practical training program, the participant came to the United States for a period of a few weeks up to 7 or 8 months. More than likely he came as a member of a group. He may have spent some time in a university, but for practical rather than for primarily academic training. He probably traveled to three or four different locations around the country to observe and take part in practical operations related to his interests.

The participant coming for an academic program probably arrived in the fall to begin the college semester with most American students. He attended at least two semesters of class and possibly more. He may have earned a degree but his main objective was to attend a university to study agriculture or home economics.

The combination program enabled the participant to enroll in a university also but for only part of a school year and only for specialized courses. The remainder of his time in the United States was devoted to practical, on-the-job type training which related to his university course work. His program, normally 8 to 12 months, also may have included attendance in a workshop or summer school.

In the past year (fiscal year 1964), almost half of all agricultural participants arriving in the United States came for 10 months or more of technical training. Most of them also enrolled in some academic program. Africa sent the largest number of participants for the longer durations. Short-term programs of 3 months or less accounted for 24 percent with almost the same percentage for programs of 4 to 6 months in length. Almost half of the participants from Africa came for 10 months of training or more. Conversely, almost half of the participants from Latin America came for less than 3 months.

SUPPORT OF THE IMMIGRATION BILL—S. 500

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have joined the list of cosponsors of the immigration bill introduced on January 7 by the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], with more optimism than ever before.

For years, there have been introduced bills which would somewhat liberalize the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act; but they have never made any progress. Hence, we have had to work out stopgap legislation to correct certain glaring deficiencies. One reason for this is that the weaknesses of the present law have not been dramatically brought to the attention of the American people. Immigration is a field in which change is genuinely feared by a great many people. But change, as it is written into Senate bill 500, is not at all alarming, once it is understood. The

1965-

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1775

discussion of the issue during the recent campaign, President Kennedy's posthumous book, "A Nation of Immigrants," and President Johnson's fine immigration message have all contributed to a new awareness of the need for revision of the immigrant quota system.

We have set an annual quota of approximately 158,000 immigrants. For many years it has been American policy, written into the law, to discriminate against Asians and southern Europeans who wish to come to the United States to live, by allotting to them unreasonably small portions of this quota. But our law has abundant restrictions applying to all immigrants, to insure that their health, moral standards, and financial security are above reproach. We could, therefore, allocate the quota by criteria other than nationality, without weakening in any way our protection against unwelcome persons. We do not want people to come here from any country if they will go on relief or if they might endanger our national security. However, every year thousands of people who meet all our requirements, and who would be desirable additions to our society, because of the skills they possess or because their presence would reunite divided families, are denied permission to come here, due to their nationality.

Over two-thirds of our total annual quota is allotted to only three national groups: those from Great Britain, Ireland, and Germany. These quotas are never exhausted, and the large surpluses are not used. Last year more than one-half of Great Britain's quota of 65,361 was unused, and more than one-third of Ireland's quota of 17,756 was unused. Other countries with very small quotas, such as Greece and Italy, have lengthy waiting lists of eligible people. The fact that such discrimination is written into the law, in a country which basically believes in equal justice under the law for all men, raises severe doubts about our sincerity.

In his testimony before the House Immigration Subcommittee, last summer, Secretary Rusk stated that in 1 year more than a dozen foreign ministers spoke to him personally about the prejudice inherent in our immigration law. I hope the well-meaning people who support the present law as a guardian of the national character will take heed of the problem which it poses for our representatives abroad, who must reconcile the national origins system with our claims of equality for all.

In short, we can approximately keep our annual total quota of immigrants, but we can make sure that it is more fairly distributed among all eligible individuals. Under the Hart bill, the national origins system will gradually be abolished and the total annual quotas will be pooled for distribution by a more equitable formula, based on skill and close relations in this country. But careful precautions are written into the bill, in order to prevent any reverse discrimination against our good friends and allies in Europe.

The change that is proposed is not one of appreciably increasing the quan-

tity of authorized immigration, but, rather, is one of changing the methods and principles by which it will be regulated. We shall not have coming to our shores significantly more aliens than those who now come. The total yearly quota will be increased by only 7,000—from 158,000 to 165,000. We shall reduce the need for private bills, 197 of which were passed by the 88th Congress; and we shall reduce the need for stopgap legislation.

Since 1957, Congress has responded to the need for revision of the McCarran Act by passing five laws which have admitted certain refugees and skilled persons. Under these laws, 141,598 eligible persons have entered the country outside of the quota, since 1957. These have been good laws, born of urgent necessity. But it ought not be necessary for Congress to legislate in each emergency. Senate bill 500 would reserve a percentage of the quota for such contingencies. This is a more foresighted and efficient approach than the stopgap legislation, since it would keep the number of entering aliens within the annual quota.

My colleagues on the Judiciary Committee cope each year with an enormous volume of private and public immigration proposed legislation. They are acutely aware of the problems of immigration and of its great historical significance in this country. I hope they will give Senate bill 500 the benefit of their knowledgeable scrutiny and will find it sound.

As a supplement to my remarks, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a pertinent editorial from the January 15 issue of the Wall Street Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNTANGLING IMMIGRATION

In his immigration message President Johnson oversimplifies somewhat, but basically seems to propose a rational course.

The immigration problem arises because more foreign nationals want to come than the United States can reasonably admit. The current system of choosing among applicants by allotting national quotas is not, contrary to inferences by the President and others, simply a manifestation of xenophobia with no basis in logic. To a certain extent, it is true that immigrants will assimilate better if they come from a culture similar to our own.

That is hardly the only relevant criterion, however, and the quota system undeniably leads to a number of anomalies. It turns away qualified applicants from some countries while quotas from others go unused. It can refuse a highly trained and skilled Asian while admitting an unskilled European, which makes it understandably hard to convince the Asian our motives are untouched by prejudice. The imperfections of the system have fostered recurring avalanches of private congressional bills allowing specific individuals to enter the United States.

A sensible alternative seems to be to put the emphasis on skills and relationships with U.S. citizens, as the President proposes. The change would correct many of the present inequities and set up a more logical criterion for picking the applicants most likely to make the largest contributions to our society.

It may be unfortunate that the proposals would reduce preferences for some countries with close ties to the United States. This effect would be mitigated by a host of temporary measures in the proposals, and more permanently by the fact that the specified skills and relationships would be found more often in those countries.

The President's recommendations apparently would not, despite the claims of some opponents, open our shores to hordes of new immigrants. The plan would increase the total quota from some 158,000 to 165,000 a year, hardly a huge number for a country of this size. There would be small increases from insuring that the total quota is fully used, and from shifting a few categories of applicants to nonquota status. There also might be a partially offsetting reduction in immigration under private bills.

While essentially the same legislative aims have been sought by four Presidents, they have received scant attention from Congress. Perhaps the lawmakers have good reason for their reluctance, but they have not made such reasons known.

In the absence of more telling objections than those usually advanced the President's suggestions seem intelligent steps toward straightening out a needlessly jumbled corner of national policy and foreign relations.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ADDRESS BY SENATOR ANDERSON

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President there is a very distinguished group of gentlemen in Washington who call themselves the Three and a Half Club. The club consists of some 40 Senators and Representatives who were formerly members of the fourth estate and have now dropped back to the third.

One of the most distinguished members of the Three and a Half Club is our colleague from New Mexico, Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON. He recently addressed the 1965 winter convention of the New Mexico Press Association. In his address, he made a very strong and moving plea for new legislation on freedom of information.

I ask unanimous consent to have his remarks printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT SECRECY

(Remarks of Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON before the 1965 winter convention of the New Mexico Press Association, Las Cruces, N. Mex., January 23, 1965)

To my great regret, I find that my tasks in Washington require that I live like the wornout saying: "Here today and gone tomorrow." I appreciate your kindness in rescheduling my appearance so I can catch a noon plane to Washington. That fact so circumscribes my time that I trust I will not talk beyond the limit of your endurance.

My excuse, of course, is that once the inauguration activities end, the work of legislating begins—and high on the list of priorities is the King-Anderson bill to extend hospital care to the aged through social security. I didn't realize how costly hospital care had become until a cattleman checked into an Albuquerque hospital for the removal of his gall bladder. He was allowed out of his bed to walk the length of a corridor the second day, but by the fifth day he was fuming and fretting to be allowed to check out and go home. His doctor explained to him the

need for 3 more days of hospital care, but the cattleman replied: "Look, doc, it's costing me about a cow a day to stay here—and I've got a mighty small herd."

It's because I want to save that cattleman and his friends a few cows that I must hurry back to Washington to press for the early passage of King-Anderson.

Having first been a working newspaperman—probably long before most of you were and possibly before some of you were born—and then having been in public life for some three decades and thereby subject, on occasion, to the arrows of the press, I early experienced the joy of the bowman and subsequently the discomfort of the target.

As a former working newspaperman and as "a working Senator"—a phrase which received some circulation last fall—I am a member of a Washington club whose size indicates the power of the press in Congress. It is the Threes and a Half Club, and some 40 Senators and Representatives are members. All of us have left the fourth estate and moved to the third estate, hence the name "Three and a Half."

With these credentials I feel I can speak frankly about at least one problem of mutual concern to the press and the public official.

While the press may be divided politically and a dozen different editorial positions could be mustered easily on any current issue, there is one subject on which the press is unanimously agreed: that is, opposition to Government secrecy—the kind of secrecy that shields from public view what the public legitimately and properly has a right to know. If I understand the position of the press, you do not want entry to what is rightly kept under cover to protect national security. But you do want access—without protracted delay and bureaucratic entanglement—to the kind of information essential to performing your responsibility fully and intelligently.

When I became Secretary of Agriculture 20 years ago, the United States was suffering its first real problems of food shortage at home. Abroad, we were faced with the task of feeding the largest share of the hundreds of millions of hungry and starving people. To do that, we took heavy supplies of food from this country. It caused some protests and outcries. So, in my first major public speech as Secretary, I discussed this massive problem and added these words: "I think it no part of the duty of a public servant to protect the people from the truth."

That is a fundamental principle of my political life, and I have used these words over and over. The Government may not always be able to tell the whole truth, but it should tell nothing but the truth.

Early in 1962, the New York Times asked me to do for its Sunday magazine, an article on secrecy. I wrote:

"While the handful of leaders who must determine the Nation's course and their advisers are men of good faith and ability, the critical questions of war and peace cannot be left to the experts, free of scrutiny by citizens and Congress. The citizen cannot abdicate his responsibility."

And I would add that the Government likewise cannot shirk its responsibility to keep the citizenry informed.

By opening up the channels of information, I do not mean the deliberate leak of information to a favorite reporter or a "trained journalistic seal" whose built-in bias makes him all but a spokesman for a particular agency or special interest. Slivers of slanted information are no substitute for frankness. The press should not lend itself to this practice, but I can understand an editor's problem when the leak from "a highly informed source" comes across his desk as copy. The editor in Washington, or elsewhere, where the "leak" may have originated, might ask his reporter for more

substantiation. But those of you who depend so heavily on the wire services have to assume that the story coming over the teleprinter has substance.

Atomic energy development is one major area of Government activity which immediately conjures up in the public mind an aura of secrecy. Indeed, there is much that remains highly classified about our nuclear weapons program—and no reasonable person quarrels with that. But there are areas involving nuclear policy which should be out in the open. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and as its chairman for two terms, I battled against the AEC when it needlessly stamped information "secret" or "restricted."

We worked diligently on the Joint Committee to give to the people knowledge and understanding of radioactive fallout. The public clearly and positively had a right to know about the possibility of health and genetic effects of fallout. We successfully developed a public record on this subject, which is of tremendous and universal importance.

The persistency with which the Joint Committee contested unjustifiable classification produced positive results and a more open policy on information. I will return to that subject a little later.

The Joint Committee's interest, of course, was limited to atomic energy. But Congress has had an interest in Government policies on information for many years. Recommendations by the Hoover Commission on Government Reorganization generated the introduction in Congress of freedom of information legislation, starting in the early fifties.

Among the principal champions of liberalizing Government information policies was the late Senator Thomas Hennings, of Missouri. His successor, Senator Ed Long, took up the challenge. Senator Long, in introducing his bill, recalled the words of James Madison, chairman of the committee which drafted the first amendment providing for freedom of the press. Madison said:

"Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who mean to be their own governors must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives. A popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it is but a prolog to a farce or a tragedy or perhaps both."

Although the principle laid down by Madison has been endorsed by public men since the birth of the Nation, a policy of disclosure is nowhere stated in law. The provision on public information of the Administrative Procedure Act has been interpreted by officials as a reason to withhold information rather than to give the public access to it.

Many witnesses before Senator Long's subcommittee testified that such phrases in the Administrative Procedure Act as "requiring secrecy in the public interest," "required for good cause to be held confidential," and "properly and directly concerned" actually became more useful as guidelines for wrongfully barring the public than for letting the people know.

The Long bill seeks to do away with vague phrases in order to set forth a clear philosophy of Government information, and to provide a court procedure by which the public and the press may obtain information which properly should be available to them. There is no remedy under existing law—and there should be—for the citizen seeking information if it is denied.

This is what the Long bill would do:

1. It sets up workable standards for what records should and should not be open to public inspection. In particular, it avoids the use of such vague phrases as "good cause found" and replaces them with specific and limited types of information that may be withheld.

2. It eliminates the test of who shall have the right to different information. For the great majority of different records, the public as a whole has a right to know what its Government is doing. There is, of course, a certain right to privacy and a need for confidentiality in some aspects of Government operations and these are protected as specifically as possible; but outside these limited areas, all citizens have a right to know.

3. It gives to any aggrieved citizen a remedy in court.

After a long history marked by continued support from the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the American Newspaper Publishers Association, Sigma Delta Chi, and other intimately involved organizations—and many members of the working press—the Long bill passed the Senate last July. It went over to the House of Representatives for committee action. But the session ended without hearings on the House side. Thus, the battle is on but the campaign is a long way from over. Although aided by the fact that the Senate has once passed the measure, it will have to again thread its way through the legislative process.

This attitude of concern about information policies is remarkable contrast from that which prevailed in another age.

The New York Tribune reporters once were barred from the Press Gallery of the House of Representatives because of a story in which one of them described the gustatory habits of an Ohio Congressman. The Congressman, it seemed, carried his bologna and crackers to the floor and lunched behind the Speaker's desk. The reporter went on to say that the Congressman wiped his hands on his bald head and picked his teeth with his jackknife.

I keep a box of licorice candy in my Senate desk, and a few months ago the United Press International carried a story about Senators who were raiding my private stock. I am not going to reveal the "reliable source" who leaked this story to the press. But we did not try to remove the United Press International reporter from the gallery. We offered him some licorice. And he took it.

Enactment of a Federal freedom of information statute would be a concrete manifestation of congressional adherence to the principle rooted in the first amendment.

Perhaps of even more fundamental importance than the proposed information statute was the decision last March of the U.S. Supreme Court in the New York Times case. The case grew out of a libel suit filed against the Times by a public official in Alabama who charged that an ad in the newspaper had libeled him. The ad, as you may recall, was a civil rights protest. The Alabama trial court awarded the official \$500,000 damages; the Supreme Court overturned that decision and the press hailed the High Court action as a great landmark decision.

Writing for the majority, Justice Burton declared: "We consider this case against the background of a profound national commitment to the principle that debate on public issues should be uninhibited, robust and wide open, and that it may well include vehement, caustic, and sometimes unpleasantly sharp attacks on government and public officials."

The Justice continued that a public official is prohibited by the court's interpretation of the Constitution "from recovering damages for a defamatory falsehood relating to his official conduct unless he proves that the statement was made with actual malice—that is, with knowledge that it was false or with reckless disregard of whether it was false or not."

The Supreme Court did not find that condition to exist in the instance of the ad in the New York Times, and thus extended to the farthest latitude ever the classic American right of the governed to criticize those who govern.

ing on others or of turning other people in.

I am informed that none have resigned to date who were involved only in reporting on others. But let me speak of reporting on others. The Air Force Academy Code is very simple. It says, "We will not lie, cheat or steal nor tolerate among us those who do."

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that cadets are not asked to turn in people who violate rules. If a cadet sees a fellow cadet who is late to formation or sees any violation of any rule, he is not expected to turn this man in. He is only expected to ask the man to turn himself in or to turn the man in to other cadets for investigation, in cases where this man is found to be lying, cheating, or stealing. Such a man is unfit to be an officer in this country's military force.

Mr. Speaker, while this is harsh and while it is not normal in our Nation's universities today, we are not speaking of a normal university situation. We are speaking of a military situation at the Military Academy, at the Air Force Academy and at the Naval Academy.

Mr. Speaker, the alternative to this would be intolerable. We cannot train military leaders who will accept or live with anything less than complete truth and honesty.

The honor code could not be continued without this kind of a rule.

I would like to say further that these cadets, though I have great sympathy for them, knew the rules. The rules were well understood. They were given months of intensive sessions by fellow cadets, and if they did not like the rules they had the opportunity to resign.

I applaud the blue ribbon committee that has been appointed. I think an investigation of a scandal of this kind is necessary, and I am sure that the distinguished gentlemen on this committee will investigate fully. I hope that each cadet and the family of each cadet will be treated with great sympathy and understanding. Yet it is my urgent plea that the honor system of the service academies will not be attacked but, rather, that the system will be preserved and perfected. This, Mr. Speaker, is my request.

[Mr. RUMSFELD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Georgia for clarifying what I think is an extremely difficult and unusual case. Perhaps inadvertently the American press has given some people the impression that the honor system must be at fault in this regard. I congratulate the gentleman, and I join him in his wish to clarify this point. Certainly the honor system has been more than worthwhile in the preservation of our system of values in the military academies.

I urge my colleagues to join in this effort. We must make clear that the honor system itself is not subject to criticism.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, if there is any party line that is stronger than that observed in this House it is that observed between those who went to the Military Academy and those who went to the Naval Academy. I congratulate the gentleman on his remarks. I do this as a graduate of the Naval Academy, and as a graduate of the University of Virginia. I applaud the committee that has been named to investigate the tragic scandal within the Air Force Academy. I am particularly confident something good will come of it, because it has on it Dean Hardy Dillard of the Law School of the University of Virginia.

I would add my voice and say that no matter what comes of this we need the honor system in the name of national security.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I thank the gentleman.

There are three Naval Academy graduates in the Congress. The graduates of the Naval Academy share with the graduates of the Military Academy their concern at this particular time.

Bill file
FEIGHAN EXPOSES MYTHICAL QUOTA SYSTEM—THREAT OF NONQUOTA IMMIGRATION DEMANDS CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STRATTON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege today to address the 36th annual conference of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies. That organization has established a meritorious record over many years in fighting for those ideals which have made our country great. The pursuit of patriotism imposes heavy responsibilities and very often brings small reward for the effort made. But this is not new. It is to the credit of all those associated with this organization that they do not seek acclaim for their efforts because their reward comes from the knowledge that they are doing what they believe to be right and necessary in any given circumstance.

Mr. Speaker, by leave granted, I insert in the RECORD the address I delivered today.

ADDRESS BY MR. FEIGHAN

Reasonable people will agree that our immigration laws are the most complex on the statute books. The complexities of the law have led to a great deal of public confusion and misunderstandings about our immigration policy—both as to theory and as to actual practice.

My remarks today will be directed to some of the realities of our immigration policy. I have singled out the major issues which should guide the current public discussion on our Nation's immigration policy. If a consensus can be found on these major issues, we stand an excellent chance of revising our immigration laws in a manner which will accord with our requirements as a nation,

both domestically and internationally, at this advanced stage of our national development.

The first issue to be examined is the national origins quota system, authorized by Congress in its present form in 1924. That system assigned an annual quota to all countries outside the Western Hemisphere, based upon a mathematical proportion of people from each of those countries residing in the United States according to the 1920 census. The quota fixed for each country was expected to serve as a ceiling on immigration from each country. No quotas were fixed for independent nations within the Western Hemisphere which were thereby favored with unrestricted immigration to the United States.

The motives behind this system of an annual quota for some countries and unrestricted immigration from others are now open to sharp criticism and lost in an emotional upheaval. But the span of 40 years since this system was instituted permits some valid conclusions. It is now clear that the far-reaching political and economic upsets in Europe in the wake of World War I, when the geography of old empires was dissolved, posed the imminent problem of immigrant arrivals from those troubled lands on a scale which could threaten the stability of our Nation at a perilous point in history. Uninformed hindsight can easily reject this conclusion of history, but justice to those who were then responsible for the destiny of our Nation requires that we weigh that conclusion against the time and tide of human events in which it was made. Further, the harsh disappointments which followed in the wake of that war with respect to a lasting peace based upon freedom for all nations and people—our war objectives—led to disillusionment and a retreat into hemispheric isolation.

Let us not forget in terms of time, that the great expanses of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans then provided us and the other nations of our Hemisphere with a high degree of national security and regional peace which has been washed away by the relentless scientific and technological progress of the past 25 years. The New York Times, in an editorial of March 1, 1924, advanced arguments in support of the quota system based upon our right to decide who shall or shall not enter, what was best for our Nation's interest as a whole rather than the special interests of any particular groups and cautioned: "The great test is assimilability." The world of our times is a far cry from the early 1920's when the quota and nonquota concepts were laid down as basic policy for our immigration program. The New York Times, like most metropolitan newspapers, has since reversed its position of 1924.

What does the record of performance over the past 10 years, as distinguished from theory, tell us about the national origins quota system? Has it worked out in practice as the theory intended? Let us look at the official record.

Take the countries of Europe as a starter. Here are some startling comparisons:

Portugal has an annual quota ceiling of 438 fixed by law. Yet the average of immigrant visas issued to natives of Portugal has run 2,736 per year during the past 10 years. There is a difference between the theoretical ceiling of 438 per year and the actual of 2,736 immigrant admissions each year.

Greece has an annual quota ceiling of 308 fixed by law. But the average of immigrant visas issued to natives of Greece has run 2,666 per year for the past 10 years. There is a considerable difference between the theory of 308 and the actual of 2,666 per year immigrant admissions.

Italy has an annual quota ceiling of 5,666 fixed by law. Yet the average of immigrant visas issued to natives of Italy has run 15,685 per year for the past 10 years. There is a noticeable difference between the theory of

2020

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

February 4

5,666 and the actual of 15,685 immigrant visas per year.

Spain has an annual quota ceiling of 250 fixed by law. But the average of immigrant visas issued to natives of Spain has run 1,264 per year for the past 10 years. The difference between the theoretical ceiling of 250 and the actual of 1,264 immigrant admissions per year is evident.

This essentially is the pattern of immigration from Europe for the past 10 years, with the exception of the once free nations behind the Russian Iron Curtain where freedom of movement is restricted and normal immigration is impossible. To summarize, of the 35 quota countries of Europe, 22 exceeded the ceiling set by the national origins quota system during the past 10 years.

Let us turn to Asia. What does the record of performance over the past 10 years tell us, as distinguished from the theory of the national origins quota system. Here are some outstanding examples.

Japan has an annual quota ceiling of 185 fixed by law. But the average of immigrant visas issued to native of Japan has run 4,887 per year for the past 10 years.

China has an annual quota ceiling of 100 fixed by law. Yet the average of immigrant visas issued to natives of China has run 2,103 per year for the past 10 years. In addition, another quota concept of "Chinese persons" has been created with an annual quota of 105. Here again the record shows a total of 5,528 immigrant visas were issued to persons in this category during the past 10 years. Over and above these totals are the Chinese refugees, from Hong Kong, who are "paroled" into the United States under a Presidential determination and who are not charged to any quota system.

Indonesia has an annual quota ceiling of 100 fixed by law. Nevertheless there have been issued to residents of Indonesia an average of 1,657 immigrant visas each year for the past 10 years.

Philippines has an annual quota ceiling of 100 fixed by law. Here we find that the average of immigrant visas issued to natives of the Philippines has been 2,281 per year for the past 10 years.

Korea also has an annual quota ceiling of 100, fixed by law. But the record reveals an average of 1,250 immigrant visas have been issued each year for the past 10 years to natives of Korea.

To summarize, there are 34 quota countries or areas of Asia and 15 of these exceeded the theoretical ceiling set by law over the past 10 years. This record of practice provides ample evidence that the national origins quota system has not worked out as originally intended.

On a worldwide basis there are 119 quota countries or areas established by the national origins system. Of this number 46 exceeded the theoretical ceiling set by law during the past 10 years.

For the source of this wide disparity between the ceiling of immigrant admissions set by the national origins system and the actual numbers of immigrant visas issued we must look to the nonquota provisions of the law. Changing times and the pressure of meeting practical human problems in the post World War II era have resulted in a long series of amendments to the basic law authorizing nonquota status for certain classes of aliens outside the Western Hemisphere. It is these new, nonquota classes which reduce the national origins quota system to a myth.

I referred earlier to the system of unrestricted immigration from the independent nations of the Western Hemisphere as the historical companion of the national origins quota system. In the 1920's immigration from the countries of the Western Hemisphere was low and mobility of movement within the hemisphere was limited. But that condition has changed. Over the past 10

years an average of 110,435 nonquota immigrant visas were issued to natives of this hemisphere each year. That figure would be much higher were it not for the requirement that applicants for admission must provide proof against the likelihood of becoming a public charge.

The full scope of nonquota immigration to the United States on a global basis can be measured by the trend over the past 10 years. During that period 1,774,367 nonquota immigrant visas were issued as against 948,334 quota visas. This means approximately a 2-to-1 ratio over quota immigration.

The January 1950 issue of the Monthly Review published by the Immigration and Naturalization Service reporting on non-quota trends pointed out, "In the quarter of a century of immigration since the passage of the Immigration Act of 1924, nonquota immigration nearly equaled quota immigration." Hence, within 15 years nonquota immigration has doubled quota immigration.

It is reasonable to conclude, based upon this examination of the record, that the national origins quota system is little more than a theory in terms of regulating immigration to the United States. If that system was intended to restrict immigration to the United States it has failed equally. It is futile to support myths, and corruptive of our national purposes to hold tightly to theories, which have little practical application.

The national origins quota system must be replaced by a new system—a selective immigration system which establishes qualitative and quantitative controls. That is the real task confronting Congress today.

President Lyndon B. Johnson, in his immigration message to Congress on January 13, 1965, stated: "The principal reform called for is the elimination of the national origins quota system." Later, in that message, he emphasized, "The fundamental, longtime American attitude has been to ask not where a person comes from, but what are his personal qualities." From these guidelines principles, upon which a new policy of immigrant admissions is to be based, a number of logical and practical questions arise.

First and foremost is the question whether people who are natives of the independent nations of the Western Hemisphere are to be considered superior to, and therefore preferable to, people born in Europe or elsewhere in the world. That is precisely what retention of the nonquota status for natives of countries of the Western Hemisphere, under provisions of the basic 1924 law would clearly imply. If we eliminate the theoretical quota system for countries outside the Western Hemisphere, which system has been labeled with being racial and prejudicial, how can we continue to justify the nonquota status for natives of independent countries in the Western Hemisphere?

The question then arises, What system shall replace the quota-nonquota concepts in the law? I favor a complete disengagement from the misleading term of quota. A numerical limit to immigrant admissions per annum on a worldwide basis is now required. The annual limit should be based upon a realistic assessment of the number of immigrants we can absorb. Our experience with immigrant admissions over the past 10 years should provide a reliable basis on which to make the assessment. The modest annual increase of 7,000 called for by President Johnson should present no real problem.

The current hassle over the national origins system has misled most people to believe that the quota of 158,361 is the maximum number of immigrants to be admitted each year. The facts are that quota immigration has been averaging 95,000 per year and nonquota immigration has been averaging 178,000 per year. That makes a grand total of approximately 273,000 rather than the misleading figure of 158,361.

It has been said that the administration bill would increase by less than 7,000 the present authorized quota. That is true. However, since an average of 63,000 of those authorized quota numbers have not been used each year and the administration bill requires that they all be used under a new system, that would mean an actual annual increase of 70,000 quota immigrants each year. Other provisions of the administration bill would result in a further increase in nonquota immigration and parole admissions. There is some doubt about the exact numbers involved. Mr. Abba Schwartz, Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, Department of State, in the course of testimony taken on August 3, 1964, admitted the overall admissions would increase to a minimum of 400,000. See page 533, part II, Immigration Hearings of 1964. This would mean an increase of more than 100,000 per year over the annual average of the past 10 years. Mr. Schwartz was one of the principal architects of the administration bill and he should know something about the numbers involved.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk, in his testimony of last year on the international implications of our immigration policy, stated that foreign ministers complain to him about the discriminatory nature of the national origins quota system which creates problems in terms of relations with the United States. Secretary Rusk made it clear the problem was not numbers of immigrants we admit, since we have the most generous immigration program in the world, but the manner in which immigrants outside the Western Hemisphere are judged on the basis of their national origin.

Similarly former Attorney General Robert Kennedy testified that he was more concerned about the method of allocating quota numbers based upon national origin than he was concerned with numbers of immigrants we admit each year. Given a choice, he hoped we would not have to reduce general immigration, but held the most important thing was to remove the penalty in the law which relates to national origin.

In light of the testimony by members of the Cabinet and the latest admonition from the President, underscoring the principal reform called for is elimination of the national origins quota system, it is fair to ask why we must at the same time increase our general immigration admissions by more than 25 percent per year? The answer to that question was not found during the 1964 congressional hearings.

The justification for this large increase if there is any must be established during the hearings which will open in the House on February 16. We will also seek clarification of the practical effect resulting from the changes made in the first administration bill, particularly the added definition of a refugee in the context of the unusual geographical definition of the Middle East to include all of north Africa. The new parole authority requested is certain to increase further the actual number of immigrant admissions each year, even though this method escapes both the quota and nonquota controls in the proposed administration bill. Further, we will need to know whether the new administration bill sent to Congress will result in an additional increase of 50,000 so-called quota immigrants beyond the 400,000 estimate, during the first year of proposed operations. If authorized but unused quota numbers from the previous year are recaptured for use in the first year of proposed operations under the new law, this added increase would be certain. The language of the proposed bill is unclear on this point and will need to be clarified.

The next major issue on which practical insight is an imperative is the problem of

distributing immigrant visas on an equitable basis. Here the administration proposal calls for a seven-member immigration board, engaging four Members of Congress in the business of the executive department, with purely advisory functions on how the quota immigrant visas are to be distributed. The drafters of the bill appear to have overlooked the constitutional principle of separate but equal divisions of the Federal Government and how maintaining the balance of powers is dependent upon maintaining the separate status for each of the three branches of Government. If our Constitution provided for a parliamentary system like that of Great Britain, under which the principal officers of the Government must be Members of the House of Commons, then the mixed member immigration board called for would make sense. But our Constitution does not permit the parliamentary system which governs Great Britain.

From a practical point of view, the unique Presidential authority over immigrant admissions called for by the administration bill could hardly be exercised by the President in the detailed manner necessary to satisfy all the facets of the problem. He is altogether too preoccupied with more important obligations. This authority would, therefore, be passed on to appointed officers of the Government, most likely the faceless bureaucracy—over whom the Congress and the people have little or no control. Anyone with experience in seeking a redress of grievances from the typical Government bureaucrat can not help but shudder at the prospect of what could happen if control of immigrant admissions was passed to them. The citizen right of petition is anchored most firmly in the Congress and our experiences over the past 20 years indicates immigration has been a matter of frequent petition for a redress of grievances. This trend is unlikely to change under the best of circumstances and Congress must retain the responsibilities involved.

We must find a new system which avoids conflict over authority and which rests upon the governing directives of clear-cut law.

One method to that end is to establish new criteria of preferences and to assign each preference a percentage ceiling of the maximum visas authorized by law for use on a worldwide basis. Limits would need to be fixed on the number of visas that could be issued annually to natives of any one country in order to guarantee fair and equal treatment to all countries.

Now, as to the preferences which would govern visa issuances within the maximum number set by law, I would urge the following preferences in this order of importance:

1. Uniting families of U.S. citizens and permanent resident aliens. Families should include those relatives covered by the present law.

The highest values of our free society are the integrity of the family and the sanctity of the home. The strength and stability of our Nation flows from a firm adherence to these values. Families, split and divided by peculiarities of law rather than free choice, are at variance with our longstanding tradition. Our first obligation should be to correct this inequity of law and to prevent its recurrence.

2. Skills, talents, and special training of applicants for an immigration visa for which there is a demonstrated need in the United States. The method now used for establishing our national needs in this regard is both inadequate and uncertain. The fault for this condition does not rest with the Secretary of Labor. Secretary Wirtz testified during the 1964 hearings that his Department had made efforts to secure authority and funds to undertake and maintain a national survey of such needs but without success. A preliminary study of the problem is now underway, however, and the results may be helpful in establishing new guidelines in law.

President Johnson proposed a new class of workers with lesser skills in his recent immigration message. The meaning and scope of this new class of preferred workers will require examination in the forthcoming hearings in the House.

The present law with respect to skilled workers requires that they be needed urgently in the United States. On this point the administration bill substitutes the requirement of "especially advantageous to" the United States. What this change of language means in terms of qualitative and quantitative application also requires clarification.

3. Haven for victims of religious and political persecution and national catastrophes. These classes of aliens have by long tradition been the beneficiaries of our humanitarian concern for the oppressed and most unfortunate. For this preference a ceiling should be set and eligibility requirements governed by a statutory definition of refugee-escapee.

The administration bill as I indicated earlier recommends a different method. It requests authority to use the parole provisions of law for refugees, with no numerical limitation set as to the number of immigrants in this category to be admitted annually.

In closing I raise several questions which are basic to the principles which I have advanced for a new, selective immigration program.

If the national origins quota system is so discriminatory and offensive to our national heritage—why must we take 5 years to abolish it? Why not abolish it forthwith.

Since the national origins quota system is in fact a myth, as I have demonstrated, why should we fear to abandon a myth which has caused dissension at home and embarrassment abroad?

Let us turn our undivided attention to the real task of finding a national consensus on a selective immigration program which meets the needs of our Nation as they in fact exist today.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, once again Congress is being asked to approve large outlays for assorted Federal aid to education projects. While it is virtually impossible to estimate the total amount of cash already being expended for school-connected projects, it is reckoned that some \$8.5 billion is being expended by the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, and other agencies for this purpose.

Yet even this vast sum is not enough for the administration, which at latest report hopes to bring pre-kindergarten tots into the Government's Chautauqua tent for exposure to the teachings and tales of erudite bureaucratic marmes and masters. Rather than promise the taxpayer that he will be allowed to keep a greater share of his earnings so that he can use it to improve educational opportunities for his own children and his community, the administration would keep more and more tax revenue in order that it can dole out our funds as it sees fit to "Donald Duck" nurseries through college campuses.

The Washington Post of Sunday, January 24, described activities for 4- and 5-year-olds in one school sponsored un-

der a grant by the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity. The class has been set up for 2 hours on Saturday mornings. Here is one paragraph from the Post:

They danced in a circle (developing social capacity), sang and played a clapping game (acquiring a sense of music and rhythm), played with a set of large plastic keys (learning the colors), visited a make-believe grocery store and examined artificial fruit (sharpening imagination and the sense of touch), marched in military fashion to the washroom, and later met Cuddles, a brown guinea pig.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know how my colleagues take to this sort of activity underwritten by the American taxpayer, but I personally find it entirely repugnant and a matter that should be investigated by the appropriate committee of Congress. By whose authority does the Federal Government provide Treasury funds to teach tiny youngsters social capacity and a sense of music and rhythm? Parents who want to teach colors to their children can get a good start by having them compare the black and red figures in the national budgets of the past few years, and they can take their youngsters to supermarkets to examine the fresh fruit whose cost is completely out of proportion due largely to the inflation caused by just such ridiculous programs as this dilly sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity. Marching in military fashion to the washroom is no doubt meant to prepare individuals for goosestepping to the cleaners when they become taxpayers. While it is no longer possible to go to market to see a fat guinea pig, the children can learn at least a trifle more about animals at the local zoo, which is maintained by the Federal Government at great cost and is open to all without an admission fee.

This prekindergarten demonstration should serve as a warning against permitting the Federal Government's getting its dancing slipper into the door of our primary and high schools. In the early grades children may be able to further their artistry by combining the development of social capacity and music and rhythm into a single operation with simultaneous dancing and clapping to the tune of supercalifragilisticexpialidocious. Thus there will be no danger of their becoming wallflowers by the time they are ready for the Government-sponsored junior cotillion and senior prom.

Now we are all prepared for the college campus, where large plastic Phi Beta Kappa keys of various colors will await the better students with outstanding social capacity and superb sense of music and rhythm. Some time ago I received a letter protesting Federal aid to education from a member of a school board in Pennsylvania's 22d Congressional District. He wrote:

Do not be stampeded into passing legislation which will gradually develop into an octopus which will have its tentacles into every hamlet in the United States of America. Government power corrupts and destroys the intrinsic worth of our citizens regardless of the good intentions which created it.

Observing that free scholarships will not necessarily "make scientists," he stated:

If an individual wants to become a scientist, and is willing to pay the price, there are all the necessary opportunities in our educational system. This is just another political plum which the professional politicians and Government bureaucrats will keep dangling before the eyes of a gullible electorate.

Perhaps it is time that Congress allow itself a spoonful of this homely philosophy. Through Treasury dollars already made available in the past few years for educational purposes, the Federal Government wields its professional ruler over many of the Nation's institutions of higher learning. To extend its largesse and gratuities into areas it now envisions will enable bureaucrats to hold the rod over a predominant number of the country's total school enrollment.

Certainly there are, at least for the time being, ample scholarships available for those who wish to become scientists or to pursue whatever career they choose. Under the National Defense Education Act a student may borrow up to \$1,000 a year for each of 4 or 5 years. He pays no interest until a year after he graduates and then pays only 3 percent. He has a 10-year period to repay, and payments are far less than on a new car. In addition, there are almost countless scholarships available through private industry, foundations, State grants, individual grants, and through numerous Federal departments and offices.

While no one qualified for college work should be deprived of the opportunity to attend an institution of higher learning if he has the interest, the ambition, and the determination, we should never forget the truism, "free scholarships do not necessarily make scientists."

Last week—January 27—was an important anniversary. It was on that date in 1880 that Thomas Edison was granted a patent for an electric incandescent lamp. Edison got no free scholarships. At 12 he was a railroad newsboy and after 15 earned his living as a telegraph operator in various cities, always studying and experimenting in his spare time. In succeeding years his inventions included—in addition to those dealing with the generation and distribution of electric light, heat, and power—stock tickers, automatic telegraph systems, the electric pen—which developed into the mimeograph—the phonograph, a machine for office dictation, and a camera for taking motion pictures.

Whether the remarkable Thomas Edison could have contributed more to mankind had he received a full education is a question open to debate, but the fact that he was not spoon-fed through his early youth by a paternalistic government certainly did nothing to discourage his driving ambition and irrepressible imagination. Energy of this nature can very well be destroyed if the task of going to college is reduced to the point where a qualified student need only apply for a Federal grant to assure a comfortable life on campus. There is also a tendency to restrict parental initiative and responsibility in the matter of a child's education through patronizing and overgenerous

government proffers. At this point in the RECORD I should like to insert a news story, originating in the U.S. Office of Education, published in the Connellsville, Pa., Courier of April 10, 1963:

LACK OF ENCOURAGEMENT KEEPS MANY BOYS, GIRLS FROM ENTERING COLLEGES

Why is it that many bright boys and girls do not go to college? Is it because they lack the funds—or, as a recent study suggests, is it because they lack the incentive?

According to U.S. Office of Education studies, two-thirds of the country's high school graduates do not go to college, although many are obviously capable of college work, having been in the upper half of their graduating classes. While it is true that some of them miss out on a higher education because they cannot afford it, the studies suggest that, more often, young people do not go to college because they have not been encouraged to do so.

For instance, the attitude of parents on the subject of college has a direct connection with a youngster's decision. Children of college graduates are most apt to be brought up with the idea that they, too, will go to college. But the survey does show that the child who is really hungry for college has a good chance of getting there, even though his parents may not be college-trained. The overriding factor is usually the encouragement of his parents. On the other hand, a negative attitude toward college—or even one of indifference—will have a negative effect on the youngster.

Then, too, as many parents know, teenagers' opinions can be heavily influenced by what their friends and schoolmates think about college. If the teenager happens to "travel" with a college-minded crowd, chances are he will also want to attend.

The very community in which the family lives can also affect a youngster's attitude toward school. For instance, young people who live near a college are more likely to attend than those who live some distance away. But this is not to say that families must move to the vicinity of a university to get young people interested in higher education. Parents can use their influence, wherever they live, to achieve the same end.

Perhaps some parents are reluctant to encourage the idea of a college because of the cost involved. The U.S. Office of Education reports that the national average expense for 1 recent academic year is \$1,550. Parents provide about \$950 of this amount, on the average. The balance comes from student earnings, scholarships and other sources, such as gifts.

But the young man or woman determined to enter college without a scholarship or financial aid from his family still has other avenues open to him. He can look into municipal or State colleges where fees are low; he can supplement tuition fees with a part-time job; or he may be able to obtain a student loan from a college, bank, or the Government. Substantial amounts of money have been provided for loans to college students by the Federal Government under title II of the National Defense Act of 1958. And some banks, in recent years, have established the practice of making available to promising students low-interest loans.

Actually, reports the Institute of Life Insurance, many families begin planning for their children's education in advance, particularly through systematic savings. According to a Ford Foundation study, life insurance most often figures in these plans. For example, a father buys an additional life insurance policy, earmarking the benefits for college expenses if he were to die before his youngster reaches college. If the father lives, as he probably will, the policy is valuable in other ways. He may use the cash value to help see his child through school, or he may

prefer to keep the policy and borrow on it if he finds that he cannot manage comfortably out of current family income.

Incidentally, parents appear to be more willing to assist their sons than their daughters through school. This is reflected in the ratio of 13 boys for every 10 girls in college. Girls who have been through college have no doubt about the value of a college education. Not long ago, a large group of women, recent college graduates, were asked what they thought about higher education. Although many had become full-time homemakers, the group as a whole said they would follow the same course if they had to do it all over. They did not feel they had been "overeducated," and, for that matter, the majority were working in jobs which required the kind of knowledge and skills learned in college. Their education, as many women know, is also valuable when a college graduate becomes a wife and mother.

Mr. Speaker, while these considerations are vital factors in the Federal-aid-to-education issue, the additional matter of Government waste and Government control haunts every home as well as every institution of learning in the United States. Each expenditure undertaken in Washington adds to, or precludes reduction of, the national debt, that ruthless manipulator largely responsible for the deflated value of today's dollar. While it is true that some of our communities are incapable of meeting necessary school expenses, there is hardly a place in the entire country whose financial status is on as low a level as that of the Federal Government, with a debt now far in excess of \$300 billion.

Federal aid envisioned by the administration has the added nefarious disadvantage of dissuading local effort toward improving school systems and providing more remunerative teachers' salaries. It furthermore penalizes the many States and communities which have already built new schoolhouses and raised faculty pay.

Even more repelling to understanding Americans is the portent of Federal control over our school systems whether it be at the kindergarten stage, in grade or high school, or in college—or at all levels. Delivering direction of these responsibilities to Washington would surrender to the bureaucracy the prescribing of curriculums and subject matter as well as complete supervision of faculty members.

One noted educator, Dr. Benjamin Fine, has said that the increasing number of research grants—from such agencies as the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Mental Health, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the U.S. Office of Education—"tumble upon the colleges in high confusion."

Each of the agencies makes its own rules and regulations and has its own standards in dealing with the colleges. Research may be contracted by one agency, supported by a grant from another, and paid for under a variety of arrangements. Dr. Fine noted also that some men are hired by colleges not because they can teach, but because they can bring a Federal research grant with them. Men are even brought in to become deans and administrators because of these grants. Dr. Fine might also have mentioned that entirely too many teachers

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1240) to provide for exemptions from the antitrust laws to assist in safeguarding the balance-of-payments position of the United States, introduced by Mr. HART, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1240

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is declared to be the policy of Congress to safeguard the position of the United States with respect to its international balance of payments. To effectuate this policy the President shall undertake continuous surveillance over the private flow of dollar funds from the United States to foreign countries, the solicitation of cooperation by banks, investment bankers and companies, insurance companies, finance companies, and pension funds to curtail expansion of such flow, and the authorization of such voluntary agreements or programs as may be necessary and appropriate to safeguard the position of the United States with respect to its international balance of payments.

SEC. 2. (a) The President is authorized to consult with representatives of banks, investment bankers and companies, insurance companies, finance companies, and pension funds to stimulate voluntary efforts to aid in the improvement of the balance of payments position of the United States.

(b) When the President finds it necessary and appropriate to safeguard the United States balance of payments position, he may request banks, investment bankers and companies, insurance companies, finance companies, and pension funds to discuss among themselves the formulation of voluntary agreements or programs to achieve such objective. If the President makes such a request, no such discussion nor the formulation of any voluntary agreement or program in the course of such discussion shall be construed to be within the prohibitions of the antitrust laws or the Federal Trade Commission Act of the United States, provided that no act or omission to act in effectuation of such voluntary agreement or program is taken until after such voluntary agreement or program is approved in accordance with the provisions of subsections (c) and (d) hereof.

(c) The President may approve any voluntary agreement or program among banks, investment bankers and companies, insurance companies, finance companies, and pension funds that he finds to be necessary and appropriate to safeguard the United States balance of payments position. No act or omission to act which occurs pursuant to any such approved voluntary agreement or program, shall be construed to be within the prohibitions of the antitrust laws or the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(d) No voluntary agreement or program shall be approved by a delegate of the President except after submission to the Attorney General for his review as to its effect on competition and a finding by the Attorney General that the actual or potential detriment to competition is outweighed by the benefits of such agreement or program to the safeguarding of the United States balance-of-payments position.

(e) The Attorney General shall continuously review the operation of any agreement or program approved pursuant to this Act, and shall recommend to the President the withdrawal or suspension of such approval if in his judgment its actual or potential detriment to competition outweighs its bene-

fit to the safeguarding of the United States balance-of-payments position.

(f) The Attorney General shall have the authority to require the production of such books, records, or other information from any participant in a voluntary agreement or program as he may determine reasonably necessary for the performance of his responsibilities under this Act.

(g) Upon withdrawal of any request or finding made hereunder or approval granted hereunder, or upon termination of this Act, the provisions of this section shall not apply to any subsequent act or omission to act.

SEC. 3. The President may require such reports as he deems necessary to carry out the policy of this Act from any person, firm, or corporation within the United States concerning any activities affecting the United States balance-of-payments position.

SEC. 4. The President may delegate the authority granted him by this Act, except that the authority granted in section 2(c) may be delegated to only officials appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, whether acting singly or jointly or as a committee or board.

SEC. 5. This Act and all authority conferred thereunder shall terminate on December 31, 1967, or on such date prior thereto as the President shall find that the authority conferred by this Act is no longer necessary as a means of safeguarding the balance-of-payments position and shall by proclamation so declare.

The letter presented by Mr. HART is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., February 17, 1965.

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Transmitted herewith for consideration and appropriate reference is a draft bill entitled "An act to provide for exemptions from the antitrust laws to assist in safeguarding the balance-of-payments position of the United States."

This bill is submitted to implement recommendations contained in the President's message to Congress of February 10, 1965, on the balance of payments (H. Doc. 83, 89th Cong.). In that message the President indicated that he was requesting the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in cooperation with the Secretary of the Treasury to enroll the banking community in a major effort to limit lending abroad. The President also stated that to insure effective cooperation by the banking community he would request legislation which would authorize voluntary cooperation by American bankers under governmental auspices and provide such exemption from the antitrust laws as might be necessary to permit cooperative plans of action. The enclosed draft bill is designed to effectuate the President's objective. Adequate safeguards are provided in the bill to make certain that joint action does not exceed that which is necessary to deal effectively with the balance-of-payments situation.

It is contemplated that as part of the program representatives of the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve System may meet from time to time with the banks and other institutions significantly engaged in foreign financing and consult with them individually and in groups concerning means of curtailing the outflow of funds through extension of credits. In this connection, we understand that the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System has already requested banks to limit credits to foreigners. It could become necessary for the President or his delegates to request financial institutions to develop and undertake specific voluntary agreements or programs to restrict their lending activities. Under this proposed legislation the President would be authorized to approve voluntary agreements or programs formulated by the cooperating institutions.

To assure full cooperation, the bill would exempt from the prohibitions of the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act activities in connection with the development and implementation of voluntary agreements and programs undertaken at the request of the Government. The proposed legislation is similar in many respects to the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950 which were in effect during the Korean war period and continue in effect to a more limited extent today.

The exemptions provided in the enclosed bill are carefully limited. The authority of the President to approve voluntary agreements and programs may be delegated only to officers appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. It is contemplated that such agreements and programs would be approved only if found to be necessary and appropriate to safeguard the U.S. balance-of-payments position. Unless an exceptional situation arises requiring direct action by the President himself, they will be approved only after submission to the Attorney General for his review as to the effect on competition and a finding by him that the actual or potential detriment to competition is outweighed by the benefits in safeguarding the U.S. balance-of-payments position. The Attorney General is authorized to require the production of any books and records that he may need in order to keep a careful watch as to the effects of any agreement or program upon competition, and to recommend to the President the withdrawal or suspension of any approval given pursuant to the act if in his judgment the actual or potential detriment to competition outweighs its balance-of-payments benefits.

The bill also provides needed legal authority pursuant to which the President can require reports so that constant surveillance may be maintained over the trends in foreign lending and other significant aspects of the President's balance-of-payments program.

The proposed enactment would expire on December 31, 1967, or sooner if the President determines and by proclamation declares that the authority conferred by the act is no longer necessary as a means of safeguarding the balance-of-payments position.

This bill has been prepared in consultation with the Treasury Department and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Both agencies join in urging its prompt enactment.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that enactment of this legislation is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Attorney General.

Beef
AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION
AND NATIONALITY ACT OF 1952

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. FELL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 to permit the adjustment of status of refugees resident in the United States, who are natives of countries contiguous to the United States or of any adjacent islands, including Cuba.

The bill eliminates the technical requirement of our immigration laws which requires such aliens to leave this country and reenter, in order to become eligible for permanent residence. I do not question this requirement for aliens who have come here through normal

February 23

procedure and in casual circumstances, and then elect to apply for permanent residence. The requirement, however, would seem to have little justification in the case of refugees from the Communist regime in Cuba. Certainly, their entry into this country was anything but normal and casual—they were under duress and fleeing oppression.

Moreover, the requirement inhibits the rather substantial Federal program of assistance administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. As Senators know, the purpose of this program is to render effective asylum by providing our Cuban guests with opportunities for self-support, chiefly through resettlement. The program is carried out in cooperation with several voluntary agencies, religious bodies, and civic organizations.

Mr. President, the talents of many Cuban refugees are going to waste because State professional licensing laws keep those without permanent status from practicing their skills or professions. This situation, and the expensive and laborious procedure to obtain this status under present law, is keeping refugees on relief rolls in various difficult circumstances. I am thinking of examples in Michigan, where, because of their immigration status, qualified Cubans have been unable to teach Spanish in the local public schools. It is obvious, however, that such refugees could fill an urgent need if given the opportunity for adjustment of status.

Examples in Michigan are multiplied throughout the country; in every State and on the public assistance rolls of the Cuban Refugee Center in Miami.

The bulk of the refugees are highly skilled and educated persons: qualified teachers of Spanish; professional, technical, and managerial workers; office personnel; and skilled workers. In my book, this reservoir of talent should be tapped to the fullest extent in the interest of the individual Cuban, for the development of our society.

Legislation to permit an adjustment of status for Cuban refugees would help accomplish this objective, and also assist in phasing out the Cuban refugee program.

Legislative action should also encourage the resettlement of Cubans to other countries in this hemisphere, where refugee talent would contribute to economic, social, and political development. And certainly, there are no more effective spokesmen to describe the destruction of freedom under Castro's brand of communism than the Cubans who have fled their homeland.

Today, however, refugees are hesitant to leave the United States. Under their present immigration status they are not assured of reentry, if for valid reasons they choose to return. The proposed bill would help remedy the situation.

The Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, which I have had the honor to serve as chairman, conducted extensive hearings on the Cuban refugee problem. On the basis of its findings, I believe that passage of the bill I offer today would have beneficial effects for all concerned.

It should be noted that the bill is permissive rather than mandatory. It does not automatically blanket all Cuban refugees with an adjustment of status. The bill is a limited measure, which will afford an opportunity for adjustment of status to those refugees who need or desire it to ply their skills and talents. The usual screening process, of course, would apply in all cases.

Public Law 85-559, enacted in 1958 for Hungarian refugees, is somewhat of a precedent for the bill I offer today.

Mr. President, I hope, sincerely, the Senate will act promptly on the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill I offer today lay on the desk for 1 week for additional cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will lie on the desk as requested.

The bill (S. 1241) to amend section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, introduced by Mr. HART (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EMPLOYMENT OF ALIENS IN A SCIENTIFIC OR TECHNICAL CAPACITY BY DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity.

This measure was drafted by the Department of the Interior, and was transmitted to the Congress with a request for introduction and reference. It would extend to the Interior Department the same authority now possessed by a number of other agencies of the Federal Government to recruit and compensate qualified scientists and technicians who are not U.S. citizens for special project and studies.

The measure would provide for adequate security and other appropriate investigations of any aliens so engaged. It is made necessary by a provision in the Public Works Appropriations Act which precludes use of appropriated funds to compensate aliens for employment in the United States except under certain restrictive conditions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and the accompanying letter from the Interior Department be printed at this point in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1243) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity, introduced by Mr. JACKSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1243

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior to the extent he

determines to be necessary, and subject to adequate security investigations, and such other investigations as he may determine to be appropriate, and subject further to a prior determination by him that no qualified United States citizen is available for the particular position involved, is authorized to employ and compensate aliens in a scientific or technical capacity at authorized rates of compensation without regard to statutory provisions prohibiting payment of compensation to aliens.

The letter presented by Mr. JACKSON is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., February 8, 1965.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity.

We recommend that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

The bill extends to this Department authority to employ aliens of any country in a scientific or technical capacity. The Secretary of the Interior is precluded by the Public Works Appropriation Act from using appropriations to compensate aliens whose post of duty is in the continental United States unless certain statutory requirements are met. Section 502 of the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1964, approved December 31, 1963, Public Law 88-257, provides in part:

"Unless otherwise specified and during the current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a person in the service of the United States on the date of enactment of this Act, who, being eligible for citizenship, had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States prior to such date, (3) is a person who owes allegiance to the United States, or (4) is an alien from Poland or the Baltic countries lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence. * * * That any payment made to any officer or employee contrary to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable in action by the Federal Government. This section shall not apply to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines or to nationals of those countries allied with the United States in the current defense effort, or to temporary employment of translators, or to temporary employment in the field service (not to exceed sixty days) as a result of emergencies."

A provision similar to that quoted above has been carried in one of the appropriation acts for several years, and it is assumed that it will be repeated in the future.

Authority similar to our proposed bill was recently granted by the Congress to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and to the Smithsonian Institution. Congress has exempted the Department of Defense from the prohibitions against employment of noncitizens. The Departments of State and Agriculture, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Public Health Service have also been given authority by Congress to employ noncitizens for certain necessary purposes.

The proposed legislation enables this Department, in the absence of qualified U.S. citizens, to broaden its area of recruitment in searching for talented personnel with unique technical and scientific skills, regardless of the country of origin of an individual being

1965

Mr. MORRIS. Is the vote a vote on the previous question?

The SPEAKER. The previous question has already been agreed to. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MORRIS. I thank the Speaker. The question is on the motion with respect to amendment No. 4.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ASPINALL) there were—ayes 157, noes 72.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks on the conference report and on the disagreeing votes, and I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state, so that Members may be advised, that the only business remaining will be a unanimous consent request by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL]. The Chair understands that the leadership on both sides have cleared the bill involved. The Chair makes this statement so that Members may govern themselves accordingly.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF FEBRUARY 15

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time for the purpose of asking the majority leader if he can give us some indication of the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan, the only legislative business we are prepared to announce at this time for next week—and this is for Tuesday of next week, and we do expect to have a further announcement on Tuesday of next week with regard to the program for the later part of next week—consists of various resolutions from the Committee on Rules dealing in the main with travel, subpoena, and investigative powers of legislative committees. One resolution, House Resolution 13, would create the Small Business Committee. The others

dealing with travel, subpoena, and investigative power are as follows:

House Resolution 84: Foreign Affairs Committee.

House Resolution 19: Judiciary.

House Resolution 44: District of Columbia.

House Resolution 68: Veterans' Affairs.

House Resolution 89: Agriculture.

House Resolution 104: Post Office and Civil Service.

House Resolution 35: Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

House Resolution 94: Education and Labor.

House Resolution 80: Interior and Insular Affairs.

House Resolution 112: Science and Astronautics.

House Resolution 118: Armed Services.

House Resolution 133: Banking and Currency.

These will not necessarily be called in the order in which they have been announced.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the majority leader.

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY FILM ENTITLED "YEARS OF LIGHTNING, DAY OF DRUMS"

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the House concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 282) expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the viewing of the U.S. Information Agency film entitled "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" at the dedication of the new Civic War Memorial Auditorium in Boston, Mass.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the city of Boston will dedicate its new Civic War Memorial Auditorium during the week beginning February 21, 1965; and

Whereas this auditorium will be a living memorial to residents of Boston who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States; and

Whereas military, religious, and civic organizations will participate in appropriate memorial exercises: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States Information Agency should make appropriate arrangements to make the film prepared by it on the late President Kennedy, "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums", available for viewing at the dedication ceremonies of the new Civic War Memorial Auditorium in the city of Boston, Massachusetts, to be held during the week beginning February 21, 1965.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLOOD INSURANCE

(Mr. MATSUNAGA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the recent floods along the west coast and

more recently the floods in Hawaii have pointedly shown the great need for a program of insurance against flood damages.

In Hawaii alone an estimated loss of over a million dollars will have to be borne by the individual property owners, many of whom will never fully recover in their remaining lifetime. Many of the owners of the 60 or more homes which were completely washed away or severely damaged saw their entire life's savings disintegrate in one unpredicted moment.

Why should this be so? One of the great attributes of an advanced society such as ours is continuity in security, as a group and as individual members of a group. The programs of President Johnson tending toward a great society would basically increase this area of security to all Americans.

Private insurance companies have contributed greatly to man's peace of mind by providing adequate coverage in life insurance and fire insurance. But they have failed miserably to provide insurance against flood damages and losses. The story appears to be the same throughout the country, as it was in Hawaii—no insurance coverage against floods.

The refusal or failure of private enterprise to enter this area of insurance is understandable. The risk is much too great. We cannot, however, continue to fall to provide for that segment of our citizenry who would be willing to purchase insurance against floods for their own security. Where private enterprise fails to provide, Government must do so.

It is on this basis that I am proposing legislation for Government insurance against flood damages to those who seek such insurance. I ask my colleagues to support me in providing a solution to an urgent and vexing problem faced by too many of our fellow Americans.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the permanent bound copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be corrected as follows:

My remarks on page 2372 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 9, 1965, column 3, should read: "In other words, it would not relate to the question which was before the House yesterday."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE CHEYENNE HORTICULTURAL RESEARCH STATION

(Mr. RONCALIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of being escorted through the Cheyenne Horticultural Research Station again 2 weeks ago and can report that it is one of the few garden spots in the entire Great Plains and the Rocky Mountains West, and is particularly one of the few places in the entire

United States dedicated to the botanical research necessary for the continuation of testing the various types of trees for windbreaks and shelter-belt trees, shrub and flower species and other highly productive tree fruits for the high altitude sections of the Central, Great Plains, and Far West States.

In my opinion, it is a mistake for the Department of Agriculture to transfer some 25 botanists and scientists from the high plains of the great West to continue research in this field so vital to the West at laboratories located in Beltsville, Md., to land some 6,000 feet lower and conditions completely different from the Great Plains.

The proposed closing of the Department of Agriculture's Horticultural Research Station has set off a volley of protest that resounds throughout the central Great Plains and extends into comparable climatic zones.

The research advanced by this station has not only answered the historical demand for tree windbreaks, but it has paved the way to the introduction of numerous varieties of tomatoes, berries, flowers and ornamental shrubs that have contributed substantially to material well-being of residents in every geographic area of our country.

The Cheyenne Horticultural Research Station, located at Cheyenne, Wyo., is situated at an altitude of 6,280 feet. The station consists of 2,200 acres, most of which is range. About 100 acres of comparatively level land are under irrigation with adequate water rights.

The station is the only station of its kind located in the Great Plains area and it has done an outstanding service in testing the degree of adaptation under the rather extreme conditions of this region.

The climate of the several arid western States is subject to severe conditions, including cold, dry winter winds, late spring freezes, and shallow alkaline soils. The entire Great Plains area is a naturally treeless plain with a semiarid climate. The annual rainfall ranges from 20 inches in the eastern area to 12 inches in the western.

This is mostly range country, comparatively windy and frequently visited by hail storms. It is more or less representative of a type of environment extending beyond the State boundaries.

Most well-known tree fruit varieties are not hardy in the Great Plains area and it is essential in order to grow fruit in this area to select varieties known to perform. The Cheyenne Horticultural Research Station provides this valuable service.

The crucial need for tree windbreaks, noted since the advent of the first permanent settlers a century ago, has been answered by the findings of researchers who have observed the tree culture of the Great Plains.

These earliest settlers had extensive areas from which to select homesites and generally located their homes near water of the region that afforded natural tree protection.

Later settlers, most of whom came to the region in homestead days, usually made their homes on dry land sites that

were lacking the natural wooded vegetation. Many of these later immigrants transplanted small trees from the banks of river streams while others obtained seedling trees from commercial sources.

Little information was available concerning methods of tree culture on the barren areas of the Great Plains and consequently many early tree plantings were largely ineffective as windbreaks. These early plantings were made without the benefit of experimental research.

Much of the research that has made possible the effective progress in this field has been the result of experiments with the seven species of deciduous trees at the Cheyenne Horticultural Research Station, established by an act of Congress in 1928 for research on various plants, including shade, ornamental, and shelterbelt trees and shrubs.

The profound significance of this research is underlined by the fact that the horticulture station, in the opinion of the Department of Agriculture—"Technical Bulletin No. 1291, Agriculture Research Service, USDA," page 12—has some of the most difficult growing conditions to be found in the central Great Plains in regard to climate and soil.

The shelterbelt research area covered by the station includes approximately 150,000 square miles in South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Colorado, and Wyoming.

Mr. Speaker, I have received letters from residents throughout this area, requesting a reconsideration of the decision to close the station.

I wish to quote Mr. Roderick W. Cummings of the Bristol Nurseries, Inc., of Bristol, Conn., who wrote me on January 22, 1965:

Wyoming is a notably stern climatic area. Thus we have noted how many nursery catalogs from States or areas of stiff winter feature Cheyenne introductions. These include Iowa, Nebraska, Minnesota, upstate New York, even Ontario. Such sections are often hard put for plants beautiful and rugged enough to serve their gardens. The Cheyenne closing would certainly limit their choice of future material.

With the proposed Great Society concept of such wonderful thoughts for improving our country, garden flowers can play a great part.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues will help me in restoring the \$206,000 appropriation to the Department of Agriculture appropriations bill for the continuation of this field station.

Its work is vital. Its work is necessary. It has made great contributions to the field of horticulture in the past 30 years.

In the catalogs of the Wayside Garden and many other fine nurseries of America, you will find listed varieties that have been groomed in the hardness of the Cheyenne area, particularly in chrysanthemums.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the contributions to the economy of our Nation which are made at Cheyenne, Wyo., by the reduction of some 700 airmen and by the closing of the Veterans' Administration facility should be ample for one community to pay, without having to

take the last spot of beauty and of research which has been set in its midst.

It would seem that this era of advancement toward the Great Society could more jealously guard this basic and established research project dedicated to beautification and productivity of the roadsides, flowerbeds, gardens, family farms and prairies of the Great Plains area.

President L. B. Johnson in his state of the Union address January 4, 1965, said:

For over three centuries the beauty of America has sustained our spirit and has enlarged our vision. We must act now to protect this heritage. In a fruitful new partnership with the States and cities the next decade should be a conservation milestone. We must make a massive effort to save the countryside and to establish as a green legacy for tomorrow.

I hope this station will be restored and ask my colleagues to join me in this worthwhile request.

IMMIGRATION LAWS NEED REVISION

(Mr. CAMERON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to revise the Nation's immigration statutes. It is a measure which I hope finds speedy enactment because in my judgment it will go a long way toward restoring our traditional attitude on a fundamental issue, an attitude which prevailed among countless generations of Americans who labored long and hard to make this country great.

That attitude didn't ask an immigrant from where he came or how he spelled his name. It was an attitude—a way of life—perhaps best summed up in these words with which we are all very familiar: "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country." And if it was found that an immigrant did—and could—indeed want to do something for his adopted country, he and his family were given an opportunity to carve for themselves a safe and secure place in the American community.

However, Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago this traditional American attitude was amended when discrimination was written into law. It became official policy to welcome immigrants who would help build the Nation—but only if they came from the "right" country or were of the "right" race or nationality.

Amended, too, was the traditional American attitude that an immigrant should be allowed to bring his family with him. Written into law were provisions which would make it extremely difficult for families to remain together and contribute as a unit to the national welfare.

The measure which I have introduced would erase discrimination from our immigration law and write into it a policy compatible with our historic traditions.

First, the bill would eliminate the present national origin quota system. Under this blatantly discriminatory pro-

1965

cedure the number of immigrants permitted to enter the United States each year from a given country is directly proportional to the number of people of similar national background who were living in the United States in 1920.

This provision is not only arbitrary and discriminatory. It is also at odds with the overall intent of the Walter-McCarren Immigration Act—to permit a specified number of immigrants to enter this country each year.

Under existing conditions the maximum number allowed to enter do not. They do not simply because many nations of northern Europe receive greater quota allowances than they desire to use. The act makes no provision for allotting heavy quota surpluses to those "non-Nordic" nations which have a much larger number of potential immigrants and a much smaller quota allowance. And because unused quota spaces cannot be reassigned a nation like Great Britain, with a quota of 65,000 persons annually, uses only about half its allowance. On the other hand, a country like Greece, with only 308 spaces a year, must go wanting.

Mr. Speaker, my proposal would abolish this discriminatory setup. It would put all available spaces into a quota pool, to be drawn upon as needed by various nations on a first-come first-served basis. The bill also declares that no area of the world shall receive more than 10 percent of the pool's total. This would prevent a large country from completely crowding out smaller areas. There would be no ethnic favoritism shown toward the nationals of one country over those of another. The measure, however, would provide for a gradual 5-year phaseout of the present system so as not to create rapid change without adequate time to adjust.

My bill would also remove the most blatantly discriminatory section in the present act, the infamous provision of the "Asian-Pacific triangle." Under this provision all citizens of Asian ancestry are placed into a single category, regardless of their place of birth. This category, representing almost all of Asia, is then limited to less than 2,000 spaces per year in the quota system, or less than 2 percent of the total.

Such provisions are not only a diplomatic handicap in our relations with such pro-Western Asian nations as Japan, the Philippines, Thailand, and Malaysia, but they are also provisions which are morally indefensible to a nation committed to the proposition that all men are created equal.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that like me most Members receive many letters each year from constituents who long to be reunited in America with parents who are still living abroad. Under present law, husbands, wives, and children of American citizens may enter the country on a nonquota immigrant basis. But for some unexplained reason parents of citizens are not given nonquota status. They must wait, often for many years, for a regular quota assignment.

My proposal would give to parents the

same nonquota status now provided for other members of the immediate family. I think I speak for all Americans when I say that parents, regardless of the age of their children, are still full-fledged and loved members of the family circle.

Some opponents of immigration law revision charge that any change will open "the floodgates" to hordes of aliens and inundate the country with unemployables. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Presently, the authorized number of quota immigrants is 158,361. My proposal would increase this figure by less than 7,000 or an increase of less than 5 percent. This is certainly not a flood. It is hardly a ripple.

Nor will this bill open the country to unemployables. It specifically states that immigrants may qualify for first preference consideration if their services would be "especially advantageous" to the United States. The Attorney General must ascertain, upon consultation with proper Government agencies, that job openings do in fact exist in an individual specialist's particular field. My proposal would also continue an existing provision which requires the Attorney General to investigate a petitioner's job qualifications before determining his eligibility for first preference.

In this regard, the bill would establish an Immigration Board, composed of four Members of Congress and three appointed by the President, to recommend to the Attorney General criteria for admission of skilled specialists and workers whose services are needed by reason of labor shortages in this country. The Board would also study and consult with appropriate Government agencies on all facets of immigration policy.

In a recent editorial, Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal made this observation in analyzing proposed changes in our immigration laws:

The quota system undeniably leads to a number of anomalies. It turns away qualified applicants from some countries while quotas from others go unused. It can refuse a highly trained and skilled Asian while admitting an unskilled European, which makes it understandably hard to convince the Asian our motives are untouched by prejudice. The imperfections of the system have fostered recurring avalanches of private congressional bills allowing specific individuals to enter the United States.

A sensible alternative seems to be to put the emphasis on skills and relationships with U.S. citizens. The change would correct many of the present inequities and set up a more logical criterion for picking the applicants most likely to make the largest contributions to our society.

I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that legislation along the lines which I have discussed will receive speedy enactment by the Congress. Only then will we be able to read without hypocrisy the verse inscribed on the Statue of Liberty:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free;
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed
to me;
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

GRAVE ERROR IN ADOPTING AMENDMENT TO CLAUSE 1 OF RULE XX

(Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I think the events of the last 2 or 3 days have directed attention to and emphasized the grave error this House made on the opening day of this session in adopting an amendment to clause 1 of rule XX. I am referring to the amendment of that rule which stated:

Any amendment of the Senate to any House bill shall be subject to the point of order that it shall first be considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, if, originating in the House, it would be subject to that point.

In this particular instance, I am referring to amendment No. 4, to House Joint Resolution 234, adopted in the Senate, which would place restrictions upon the Veterans' Administration. No one would contend that there is any relationship between this supplemental agriculture appropriation bill passed in the House, and the conduct of the affairs of the Veterans' Administration, regardless of what your position is with reference to the proposed VA amendment.

For years, this House has permitted the Senate to emasculate legislation originating in this body, by the addition of amendments which would be rejected in this body on a point of order that the amendments were not germane. We have sacrificed our dignity, we have acknowledged our inferiority, we have refused to recognize the inequity of the situation, and we have attempted to justify our action by the specious argument that all of this is necessary to maintain comity between the two branches of Congress. I for one am fed up with all of this foolishness, and I think it is time for the leadership of this House, on both sides of the aisle, to assert our rights, to regain our dignity, and to insist that we make the rules of the game apply with equal fairness to the Members of both bodies of Congress.

When House Joint Resolution 234 was sent back to this House with an amendment which was not germane and which would have been ruled out of order if it had been offered in the House, the opportunity should have been available for any Member of this House to have raised that point of order. The change made in rule XX on January 4, instead of improving, merely worsened a condition which has long existed and which should have been corrected years ago.

In closing, may I suggest that particularly the newer Members of this House might be interested in reading the very limited debate which took place on the amendments to the rules of the House which occurred on the opening day of this session, and which are recorded on pages 20 and 21 of the Record of January 4, 1965, when the gentleman from Virginia, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee pointed out some of the

dangers and attempted, unsuccessfully I regret, to have debated this most important issue.

TO ESTABLISH A FAIRMINDED REPORT ON SELMA, ALA.

(Mr. SELDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, last week several of the leading citizens of Selma, Ala., urged that a fairminded, objective, and duly constituted congressional committee visit their city to ascertain the true facts concerning racial turbulence that has taken place there in recent weeks.

In an effort to bring this request before the Congress, I introduced last week, along with my colleague from Alabama, Hon. GEORGE ANDREWS, a resolution providing for the establishment of a bipartisan joint congressional committee to investigate the causes of current racial tensions that presently exist in Selma.

The resolution in question was referred to the House Rules Committee, and on Monday both Congressman GEORGE ANDREWS and I appeared before the committee in support of the measure. Today the Rules Committee met but failed to act on the resolution, and I understand the votes necessary to bring this legislation to the floor of the House are not available.

It is most regrettable that the Rules Committee did not recognize in today's deliberations the need for a balanced, fairminded, congressional report on Selma's problems. Such guidance as Congress needs in these matters certainly cannot be given by self-appointed hit-and-run congressional investigators, who approach the situation in Selma with a preexisting bias.

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. O'HARA of Illinois' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. HORTON'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

HORTON BILLS TO BLOCK AID TO NASSER AND SUKARNO

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced two bills today. Both would prohibit further U.S. assistance to two foreign countries whose government chiefs are among the most notorious troublemakers known to history.

One bill is aimed at President Gamal Abdel Nasser of the United Arab Repub-

lic, the other at President Sukarno of Indonesia.

I was very disappointed when we reversed ourselves earlier this week and went along with the Senate alteration of our original action blocking the sale of surplus farm goods to Nasser. Therefore, I now offer legislation that would amend the Foreign Assistance Act to prevent any further aid to Nasser and his Indonesian "partner in crime," Sukarno.

I think Americans are sick and tired of being insulted by the troublemaking heads of the United Arab Republic and Indonesia. We keep giving, only to get in return contempt and castigation.

Nasser openly has denounced our aid. Why then should we continue to pour it on him? He defies international law, foments trouble with his nation's neighbors and pillages U.S. property.

Similarly, Sukarno's increasing attacks on our ally, Malaysia, and renouncing of U.N. membership do not qualify Indonesia for any additional aid from the United States.

Mr. Speaker, as evidence of the repugnance which the American people feel toward any additional aid to Nasser, I include with my remarks the following letter I received setting forth the text of a resolution adopted by a group of distinguished constituents:

TEMPLE SINAI OF ROCHESTER,
Rochester, N.Y., February 5, 1965.

Hon. FRANK HORTON,
U.S. Representative From New York, House
Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The following resolution was passed by the Youth Group of Temple Sinai on January 31, 1965:

"Whereas the United States is providing the United Arab Republic with millions of dollars in aid; and

"Whereas the United Arab Republic uses some of this money to buy arms for use against nations friendly to the United States, such as the State of Israel; and

"Whereas the United Arab Republic accepts aid from the Communists and frequently sides with them in international disputes, thus playing the East against the West for their own benefit; and

"Whereas the United Arab Republic has allowed a U.S. Information Agency library to be burned down; and

"Whereas the United Arab Republic has told the United States to go jump in the lake: Be it

"Resolved, The Temple Sinai Youth Group opposes any further aid to the United Arab Republic as long as it continues its present policies."

Sincerely,

SUSAN GARNER,
Secretary.

AN EASY-PAYMENT PLAN FOR TAX ARREARS

(Mr. SAYLOR (at the request of Mr. GURNEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, recognizing that many taxpayers are finding themselves in an unintended and most unfortunate financial trap created by the 1964 withholding rate, my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. Urr], and I have introduced resolutions to pro-

vide an easy-payment plan for those in arrears as a consequence.

Millions of taxpayers are finding that their total tax bill for last year was not covered by payroll deductions. Others will be in for a shock when they get around to working on their returns. This situation is understandable, as the cut from 18 to 14 percent in withholding took place 2 months after the beginning of the tax year and fell short of averaging the expected 15 percent necessary to absorb the normal tax bill.

H.R. 4607 by the gentleman from California [Mr. Urr], and H.R. 4659 as introduced by myself, would permit such debts, which many of the taxpayers acquired without their actual knowledge to make up the difference, by spreading payments over the next year. No interest is to be charged.

In fairness to all, the Government must make it as easy as possible for everyone to meet this tax obligation, and my colleague and I feel our legislation is the most practical approach to the problem.

"COME LET US REASON TOGETHER"—OR ELSE—

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. GURNEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, we are given to believe that sweet reason is the byword of the Great Society. The President himself has given us the text: chapter 1, verse 18 of the Book of Isaiah, which begins "Come now, and let us reason together."

This is a good text and I wish the Great Society would put it into practice. The fact is, however, that it has not done so and shows no signs of doing so.

Instead, the word is passed down from on high draped with slogans and garished with glowing phrases, and immediately all avenues to reason are closed. Every alternative suggestion is met with stony, sometimes bemused, silence. Opposition is trampled under by the Great Society's vast, unquestioning majorities in Congress, marching in compliant lock-step.

We have already seen this process working in many committees, as they work on Great Society programs, and we have seen it working on the floor.

In my own Committee on Public Works, the majority party has steadfastly refused to adopt even the slightest technical amendments to the Appalachia bill, no matter how justified and improving. This vast and fundamental legislation is to be accepted down to the last comma and period, unchanged and unquestioned just as it came from the Senate.

The text from Isaiah is a good one, all right, but it occurs to me that the real text of the Great Society comes from the two verses that follow. These read, you will recall:

19. If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land:

This situation is not entirely the fault of the regulatory agencies. Their agenda is often overburdened. And without any forceful presentation of the consumer position, the public interest quickly becomes a subject for rhetoric rather than representation.

We all too easily assume that our consumer interests will somehow be protected by the invisible hand of competition or the tug of war between organized producer and distributor groups. But it is increasingly clear that this is not the case.

Legislation must be provided, therefore, to help consumers help themselves. The goal is not to create an agency to tell the people what they want. It is to give the people an opportunity to tell us what they want.

An Office of Consumers would serve as a central clearinghouse for complaints from consumers who presently are baffled by not knowing where to turn. Centralization of existing programs will help relieve such confusion. For example, one of the central problems of consumer protection is insuring effective enforcement of existing law. Consumers often are unaware of what protection is already available under present legislation, hence litigation that is justified is often never initiated. An Office of Consumers would seek to inform the people of their rights and give them direction and advice for the prosecution of their needs and grievances.

The Office would also be empowered to provide a consumer information service similar to those in the Department of Agriculture and Commerce intended to aid farmers and businessmen in investment and purchasing decisions.

Yet another function of the Office would be consultation in the formulation of legislation. In this sense, Congress itself would be among the chief beneficiaries of the new Office. Time and again, in considering legislation, Congress needs an evaluation of that legislation's effect upon consumers. And after the legislation has been passed, Congress needs to know whether the ends sought for have been achieved, or whether further action is necessary. The Office would also be empowered to communicate consumer interests to the President prior to the formulation of the budget.

Increasingly, the citizen's role as a consumer is matching the importance of his role as producer. Last year, consumer purchases amounted to nearly two-thirds of our gross national product. It is time we acknowledged the changes that have taken place within our economy since we took it for granted that consumer needs and rights were automatically protected by market competition. We are in the midst of an organizational revolution wherein men express themselves through interest groups with power, influence, and access to centers of decisionmaking. No such representation is available to the American consumer. Too long he has been a victim of

economic factors beyond his control. It is time that such victimization cease and that Congress make provisions for effective consumer representation in the structure of the Federal Government. In my judgment establishment of an Office of Consumers is long overdue and should occupy the highest priority on our legislative agenda.

HORTON BILL TO END POST OFFICE WORK MEASUREMENT SYSTEM

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to prohibit the use of measuring devices to measure the work of an individual employee in the postal service. This legislative proposal parallels a measure I sponsored in the 88th Congress.

Call it what you will—work measurement system, guidelines, and so forth—the measuring program of the Post Office Department works against postal employee morale and threatens initiative in the ranks of tens of thousands of dedicated postal clerks.

For a long time, I have hoped that the Post Office would eliminate this demoralizing system as the result of administrative action. To that end, I have urged the Postmaster General on numerous occasions, but to no avail.

Therefore, I feel it is again necessary for me to join many of my colleagues in pressing for legislative action that will forbid further use of individual work measurements in the postal service where their effect impairs efficient and economical operation.

On various inspection visits of the post offices which serve my home community of Rochester, N.Y., I have seen firsthand the undesirable effects of the work measurement program. Time and again, career postal workers have documented for me the problems brought about by a system that sacrifices accuracy for speed.

Postal clerks are subjected to constant tension throughout their work day. Using arbitrary standards that fail to accommodate variation resulting from mail thickness and packing practices, the work measurement system often imposes an impossible goal for postal workers.

Mr. Speaker, the employees of this Nation's postal service rank with our military in their desire to assure the sound future of America. I think it flies in the face of that dedication to subject them to harsh restrictions in their day-to-day performance.

Certainly, efficiency is necessary in the operation of the Post Office Department. No group more than the postal clerks of America realize this and seek to upgrade it at every step. So, let us look for standards and systems that place more credit on the ability and loyalty of the postal workers for it is there we will find the most efficient future for mail movement in this country.

IMMIGRATION HEARINGS

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 27 of this year I announced that hearings on immigration legislation would start on February 16, 1965. That announcement was made after I had discussed the date with the gentleman from New York, Chairman CELLER, and he expressed no objection to that date.

Since that announcement, Chairman CELLER has scheduled hearings before the full Judiciary Committee on presidential inability, which causes a conflict with the date I had previously announced for the start of immigration hearings. It now appears those hearings by the full Judiciary Committee will continue through the week of February 15. In view of this development, hearings on immigration legislation will be delayed until hearings are completed on presidential inability. A definite date will be announced as soon as circumstances permit.

ARE 200,000 DOCTORS WRONG?

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I returned this week from a meeting of the house of delegates of the American Medical Association at which AMA president, Dr. Donovan F. Ward, made a stirring enunciation of principles which every American should read.

Dr. Ward asks the question: "Are 200,000 doctors wrong?" And he answers: they certainly are—in assuming that the truth spoken to the people would overcome falsehoods.

Dr. Ward points out that only in the world of pressure politics and propaganda, where election votes are the coin of the realm, is the truth what you can make people believe and hope it is—a fact highlighted by the recent Gallup poll finding that 77 percent of the American people have an erroneous conception of the administration's so-called medicare bill. I commend Dr. Ward's remarks to the attention of the Members of this House:

ARE 200,000 DOCTORS WRONG?

(By Donovan F. Ward, M.D., president of the American Medical Association, delivered at the special convention of the American Medical Association House of Delegates, Pick-Congress Hotel, Chicago, February 6, 1965)

Are 200,000 doctors wrong?

I put the question, first, to the members of this house: Is it possible for an entire profession of dedicated men and women—engaged in all the arts, the sciences and the practices of merciful healing—to be so nearly of one mind about a matter affecting human health—and, at the same time, be wrong?

Is it possible, my colleagues in medicine, for us to go forth every day among 190 million Americans; to be with them in our of-

ices, in their homes, in hospitals and clinics; to be with them at birth and death and the most critical moments of their lives—is it possible for all of us to be so close to all of them, all the time, in all these places—and still be wrong?

My answer—and do not be shocked—is "Yes," we have been wrong.

Oh, no—not wrong in our assessment of the King-Anderson bill which has so shamefully been misnamed "medicare"—not at all wrong in our steadfast opposition to this measure, nor in our exposing of it, page by page, for the cruel hoax that it is. No, in our opposition to this political creation called medicare—which has no medical care in it—we doctors have been professionally justified and morally right. Therefore, we will continue—and, in the time that remains for truth to take hold—we will intensify our efforts to advise the American people, yet again, that medicare is a lure—not a cure—for the problems of the aged, and that a genuine medical program is available.

But I did say we doctors have been wrong about something. In one important aspect of this crucial struggle which now approaches a climax in Congress, we made an erroneous assumption. We assumed, wrongly it appears, that the truth—spoken to the people—would overcome the lie in short order.

We made this assumption because that is what happens in the world of science and medicine. When the truth about a disease appears in the laboratory and is proved in clinical tests, that is the end of error. Among doctors and scientists, the known truth stands on its own; it needs no special pleading because the opposition simply drops away. In the world of medicine, the only ones who seek to gain from lies are quacks—and the American Medical Association has its ways of dealing with them, and of warning the public away. But, in that other world of pressure politics and propaganda—where, election votes are the coin of the realm, and where the truth is what you can make people believe and hope it is—in that world, we doctors had something to learn, and we have learned it.

We have learned it the hard way—and late, but, hopefully, not too late.

We have learned that a false promise, if it is given a fancy name, can be kept alive year after year—in spite of the truth—if drummed and promoted constantly among the people.

Year after year, we have seen a piece of political quackery called medicare die in Congress, its promoters defeated by the sound judgment of the majority of the House Ways and Means Committee and by lack of support in our National Legislature. After each of those beatings, we thought medicare would not dare show its false face again. We were wrong—it came back during the next election.

In 1960, solidly supported by the doctors of this country, Congress passed the Kerr-Mills law, granting Federal funds to the States to expand their medical assistance to the aged programs and to develop new ones. This law made it quite possible for every State to offer to its needy elderly citizens substantial medical and hospital benefits—far in excess of the shallow benefits of medicare. Now, certainly, we doctors thought—the drums for government medicine will no longer boom the name of medicare into the ears of the elderly. Again, we were wrong. The drumbeating for medicare grew even louder, drowning out the word about Kerr-Mills, diverting the attention of those who need its benefits from the fact they are available increasingly throughout the country.

In the meantime, we doctors—on those occasions and through those channels which have grudgingly been made available to us—have gone before our patients, the Ameri-

can people, and tried to tell them the truth about medicare.

We have called it a deception, and publicly proved it, itemizing these as the reasons:

Medicare would cover only a miserly fraction of the total medical costs of someone who is really sick. It would provide only limited hospital benefits and some nursing home care in some nursing homes. For hospital outpatients, it would cover certain diagnostic tests, after the patient himself had paid the first \$20. That is all. We have repeated—that is all there is to medicare. That is all.

The patients pay the entire cost of everything else.

Doctors and surgical care would not be provided by medicare. Necessary private nurses would not be provided. Drugs outside the hospital are not provided, and are even limited within the hospital. The patient pays for these things. That is medicare—a bed, and the sound of drums. When the bed time runs out, the Government runs out.

We doctors have charged—not only that medicare is a deception, but it is also a danger—and we have itemized our reasons:

It would impose Federal controls upon our hospitals, adding to their costs and burdens of administration, determining admissions and discharges of patients; and setting budgetary standards that have nothing to do with sickness. We know who suffers when a budget replaces medical judgment—our patients.

Medicare would endanger the relationship between the patient and his doctor by denying the doctor his full range of choices in treatment and also by institutionalizing that which is private.

And another danger—to the social security system itself—the economic protection for millions of Americans over 65. Raising social security taxes to cover the enormous and unpredictable costs of hospitalization for millions must certainly endanger the entire system.

And medicare also poses a serious danger to our healthy and rapidly growing system of private voluntary insurance plans which already cover more than 80 percent of all Americans over 65—providing doctor and medical benefits if they choose, as well as hospitalization.

All of these things we have cited to the American people to support our contention that the King-Anderson medicare scheme is a deception and a danger. We know that those who heard our arguments gave us heed. In October of last year, we noted that the Gallup public opinion polls had shown a steady decline in public support for medicare, dropping from a majority of 67 percent in favor of social security medicare in 1961 down to minority 44 percent during the election campaign that sent the present Congress to Washington.

In analyzing the results of the election and discussing the so-called mandate now claimed by the administration, another outstanding opinion-poll publisher, Samuel Lubell, made an exception of medicare from any such mandate. He said—and I quote: "My interviews . . . showed that details of the administration's proposal are not understood and that the opposition of voters rises when they learn how limited is the assistance that would be provided and what it would cost in tax increases."

So, we were right when we stated that the more people know the facts about medicare, the less they want it.

But we were wrong in our belief that the truth about medicare would spread rapidly enough to overcome the lie. We learned about the error in our assumption on the very day the new Congress met in Washington to receive as a first order of business the special White House message calling for the enactment of medicare. For on that

very day, January 4, 1965, the latest Gallup public opinion poll on medicare was published. We read it with shock and amazement.

On the very day the administration rushed to the new Congress with its mandate and—in the name of the people—demanded the enactment of medicare as the first order of business—on that very day the Gallup poll revealed that 77 percent of the American public were mistaken in their understanding of what medicare is, or they just did not know.

I will quote from this amazing finding of the Gallup poll: "4 persons in 10 (40 percent) are mistaken in thinking that this program would cover the fees of doctors, surgeons, and dentists. Another 37 percent say they don't know, leaving only 23 percent who are correct in saying the program would not pay for these services—many people were unable to express an opinion on this question of whether the program would pay for all hospital or nursing bills."

I now ask this house of delegates another question—and I pray this same question will be put just as clearly to the House of Representatives in Washington. Can anyone honestly claim there is a mandate for medicare from the American people, when 77 percent of the people—three out of four—have a tragically mistaken understanding of its provisions, or honestly admit they do not know?

Are 200,000 doctors wrong in urging Congress to pause in the headlong rush to exercise a mandate that does not exist?

Can we be wrong in urging the many new Members of Congress, whose votes are already being counted on to swing the balance in favor of medicare—in urging them to first study the reasons why medicare has been defeated time and time again in previous Congresses? To do this before they begin their congressional careers with a vote they will live to regret, and will regret all the more because it would establish a permanent system they can never repeal, supported by a crushing tax that can only go up, and up.

Are 200,000 doctors wrong in urging the Congress to give serious consideration to the one measure now before it that offers genuine medical and hospital benefits to the needy aged? This is a bill authored neither by the Republican Party nor the Democratic Party. It is a bill with bipartisan parentage—the Herlong-Curtis eldercare bill, H.R. 3727. We urge Congress to compare, and the people to compare this bill with its genuine benefits and realistic financing—and with its provision allowing for administering a health program through health agencies of the States—to compare it feature by feature with medicare.

If the drums can be stilled long enough to make this comparison, it will be found that the Herlong-Curtis eldercare bill can cover not only the cost of hospital care and nursing homes for the aged, but also payment of physicians and surgical and drug costs which medicare would not do.

It will be found that the Herlong-Curtis eldercare program will be financed by Federal-State matching funds, expanding and strengthening the established Kerr-Mills law.

It takes into account the fact that nearly two-thirds of our elderly have already protected themselves against illness by private insurance policies—that old people do not want to become an added tax burden on their own children. But, medicare would bring into existence an enormous permanent mechanism imposing heavy additional taxes on all working people for all the years of their working lives so that everybody—the well off as well as the poor, the proud as well as the humble, the cheaters as well as the deserving—would be taken into a compulsory Government system.

Are 200,000 doctors wrong in asking that careful study be given to the Herlong-Curtis eldercare bill, the only medical aid for the

communications and the use of communications satellites;

- (8) Federal power matters;
- (9) civil aeronautics;
- (10) fisheries and wildlife;
- (11) marine sciences; and
- (12) Weather Bureau operations and planning, including the use of weather satellites.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$442,700, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

IMMIGRATION REFORM NEEDED NOW

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the second sentence of the Declaration of Independence contains the following words, "All men are created equal."

These five words say more about the principles behind the founding and growth of this great country of ours than any other five in the English language. These few words explain our insistence on justice for all; these few words are in the definition of freedom. Because of these words, great people from the world over have come to the United States and helped to make our greatness a lasting thing. Through wars, both civil and foreign, through peace, both firm and shaky, these few words have endured as our guiding light.

For the past 44 years, we have told people in many nations that we no longer practice what we preach; that we no longer believe in the words of our Declaration of Independence; that we have, in fact, betrayed the principles that have made this country the greatest in the world. We have been saying, in effect, that if we were born in northern and western Europe we are more equal than someone born in southern and eastern Europe; but if we were born in southeastern Europe we are, nevertheless, more equal than those born in Asia or Africa. This could not be further from the truth, and I believe that the time has come to reconcile our actions with our beliefs. It is time we take a serious look at our immigration policies and once and for all put an end to the discriminatory practices we have employed since 1921.

We are very fortunate to have before us a bill that will help to do exactly that. The bill, S. 500, was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]. It is similar to the legislation urged by the late President Kennedy and given priority by President Johnson. In general, this piece of proposed legislation will do away with discrimination against applications for immigration visas on the grounds of national origin.

While the bill does not open the gates to all aliens applying for immigration, it does so drastically modify the present immigration regulations so as to do away with the injustice and waste created by our present regulations. While the present national quota on immigration of 158,361 will only be increased by less than 7,000, far more people will enter the United States, new citizens who can be of great service to the country.

The bill will take the total number of quota numbers and divide them into three classifications. The first classification will consist of 50 percent of the numbers. Persons falling into this classification will be those who in the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States will be "especially advantageous" to the country.

The second classification will be 30 percent of the total quota numbers and will be issued to unmarried sons and daughters of U.S. citizens who are not eligible for nonquota preference because they are over 21 years of age.

The third classification will consist of the remaining 20 percent of the quota numbers, with preference issued to spouses and unmarried sons and daughters of aliens admitted to this country for permanent residence; and, finally, to other miscellaneous applications for immigration.

There are two good aspects of the bill that are definitely worthy of mention. Under the proposed reforms, every country is limited to 10 percent of the quota numbers in each classification. If, after 10 months of the year, it is apparent that all the numbers in a given classification will not be used in the year, the 10-percent ban can be lifted to allow the full use of the quotas allocated. There is a great deal of wisdom in such a proposal. All too often, the quota numbers given an individual country under the present system are unused, but the visa applications in another country may far outnumber the quota numbers available. Under the proposed system, surplus quota numbers can be shifted to another country to meet particular demands, thus making it possible for deserving individuals to immigrate to the United States when otherwise they would be unable to do so. The 10-percent ban also prevents one country from monopolizing the quota numbers to the exclusion of other countries.

Under the proposed system, citizens from all countries would have equal opportunity to immigrate to this country regardless of the geographical location of their country. It seems to me that this system is only fair and right and is in keeping with the American tradition.

The other stipulation that makes S. 500 an outstanding bill is the clause that permits unused quota numbers in one classification to be transferred for use in the next lower classification. Again we see a provision that will eliminate the waste of quota numbers that exists under our present laws and makes the structure of the quota regulations far more flexible.

In summation, the administration bill will make it far more possible for highly qualified foreign citizens to immigrate to the United States, do away with our present discriminatory practices, and assure the fullest use of the quota numbers available. In addition, the refugee reform provisions in the bill will make it easier for people who are fleeing from tyranny to be welcomed to the United States as refugees.

All of us in the Senate have sponsored private bills for individuals wishing to immigrate to the United States and are fully aware of the great inequities of our present immigration laws. We are fully cognizant of the heartache and dashed hopes that surround most immigration cases with which we must deal. With full knowledge of the present inadequacies, I say the time has come to act.

The bill introduced by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] will help to eliminate the hypocrisy of our position and let the world know that the United States is a country settled by immigrants, brought to greatness by immigrants, and is still a country that welcomes immigrants regardless of their national origin. Let us again say with pride, "all men are created equal."

Mr. President, as a cosponsor of S. 500, I urge every Member of this body to give the bill his most careful consideration and join me in helping to pass this urgently needed legislation.

MATERIALS RESERVE AND STOCK-PILE ACT OF 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 28, which was reported today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 28) to insure the availability of certain critical materials during a war or national emergency by providing for a reserve of such materials, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, no action will be taken on this bill today, but it will be the pending business as soon as the morning hour is completed tomorrow.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE MESS IN VIETNAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the tragic events in Vietnam over the week-end should give all Americans reason to pause and call for a reassessment of our position in South Vietnam.

It is, of course, difficult to have such reassessment until all the facts concerning the latest events have been made known. Hopefully they will, although judging by past experience on the manner in which the news from South Vietnam has been managed, it is doubtful whether the American public will be made privy to the full details of what is actually transpiring in Vietnam.

The past management of the news from Vietnam is well set out in a very comprehensive article by James A. Wechsler in the Progressive for February 1965 entitled "Vietnam: A Study in Deception."

Mr. Wechsler's judgment is:

But whatever place the Vietnam involvement may occupy in our military annals, it has already become a classic case history in the uses—and misuses—of Government deception to sustain a course that deserved the fullest national awareness and debate.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wechsler's excellent article be printed in full in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit No. 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, much of the news thus far released from South Vietnam, the Pentagon, and the White House raises many more questions than it answers.

The reasons for the tragic loss of American men killed and wounded in the Vietcong attack on Pleiku cannot be glossed over by Secretary McNamara saying:

The fact is that the attack was carried out in the dead of night; it was a sneak attack. It's typical of guerrilla operations. It's the kind of attack that it's almost impossible to provide effective security against. I think it's the type of attack we must expect more of in this type of war.

The facts as published to date indicate a deplorable lack of effective security precautions. We are engaged in a war in South Vietnam—an undeclared war, to be sure—but a war in any event. The rules of war do not limit the fighting to the daylight hours between the hours of 9 to 5. Nor do the rules of the war require that the enemy give us a certain number of hours advance notice before attacking. That is true whether it is a conventional war or a guerrilla war. Secretary McNamara cannot gloss over the lack of security at Pleiku by attributing our losses to a "sneak" attack which we must expect because we are fighting a guerrilla war. Indeed Secretary McNamara's "sneak attack" characterization may well deserve the award of the silliest statement of the year, if not in the whole history of statements from the Pentagon. The warriors there will know that surprise is an essential concomitant of military action in war.

Apparently we have learned little about security since the destructive attack on the Bien Hoa airbase 2 months ago.

The time is long past due for a full scale inquiry into security precautions and the lack of them in South Vietnam. The people of the United States have a right to know why security precautions have been so lax as to permit hostile troops to come right into our compound and destroy our airplanes and kill and wound our men.

Another point deserving explanation is the oversimplification of the problem by Secretary McNamara in his news conference yesterday. The distinct impression was given that a group of North Vietnamese soldiers crept down the Ho Chi Minh trail in the dead of night, went through our defenses, killed and wounded our men, destroyed our airplanes, and returned to North Vietnam unscathed. With such a simple explanation, it then becomes easy to say that, tit for tat, we attacked North Vietnamese bases in southern North Vietnam. But things are not quite that simple, judging from later reports. Was this entirely a North Vietnamese raid—where were the Vietcong, whose supposedly friendly villages were used as the staging area for the attack? Was this entirely a North Vietnamese raid or was it the usual Vietcong raid, as at Bien Hoa, which again caught us with our britches down?

The basic fact remains that we have no business in South Vietnam. We cannot "advise" a war weary people such as the South Vietnamese how to fight when they have no desire to fight.

Let us suppose that we do escalate the war in South Vietnam by destroying all of North Vietnam and subjugating its people. We would still be left with South Vietnam where a civil war would still continue to rage. If then we militarily subjugated all of South Vietnam, where would the United States be? We would have two colonies, ruled by military might far into the future, with the hatred of the peoples of both colonies against the United States growing stronger by the day—and a ghastly necrology of young American lives lost and a staggering financial cost which will totally undo all of President Johnson's economy efforts.

We cannot instill love and respect and support in the people of South Vietnam for their government in Saigon by brute, military force.

I have said before and I say again: the war in South Vietnam should be brought to the conference table and the sooner that is done the better will be the U.S. stature not only in South Vietnam but in the entire free world.

The New York Times, this morning, said in its lead editorial:

Each incident like Pleiku, each political crisis, each month that passes, increases the danger to us to southeast Asia and to the world. The strike at North Vietnam was understandable and justifiable as a tactical response in a war situation. It was not a substitute for a policy. There was an exchange of blows which left the Vietnamese situation in status quo. What the Johnson administration now has to explain is where we go from here.

The observations in the New York Times editorial were most cogent and I ask unanimous consent that the entire

editorial from today's New York Times be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There is also an interesting article in the New York Times this morning by Charles Mohr entitled "Questions on Air Strike—Explanations of Events Behind Action Leave a Number of Points Unresolved." Mr. Mohr raises questions about what happened in South Vietnam which the American people have a right to have answered. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Mohr's article also be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit No. 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Progressive, February 1965]

VIETNAM: A STUDY IN DECEPTION

(By James A. Wechsler)

Diplomats and historians will one day offer their considered assessment of the war in Vietnam and the role of the United States in that conflict. The verdict, like so many postmortems, will hinge in large measure on how the story ends, and in the early days of January 1965, when these lines are written, the fog of uncertainty remains thick. If, for example, the conflict should terminate with the beginning of broad negotiations for an Asian detente and the initiation of meaningful discourse between Washington and Peking, the American policymakers may emerge with larger distinction than now seems likely; it may well be argued in retrospect that only prolongation of the long, desperate stalemate paved the way for such an outcome. Other, far more ominous alternatives still confront us, including, of course, the most awesome peril that we will stumble into large-scale collision with Red China on this bleak terrain—surely the most intolerable example of "the wrong war in the wrong place at the wrong time."

But whatever place the Vietnam involvement may occupy in our military annals, it has already become a classic case-history in the uses—and misuses—of Government deception to sustain a course that deserved the fullest national awareness and debate. In fact, from Saigon to Washington, there has been a war within a war—a conflict between a small, gallant band of journalists who conceived it their first function to tell the country the truth, and certain elder statesmen of the press who had voluntarily assumed the role of advance men for influential voices in the Pentagon and the State Department.

If much of the country has suffered a sense of bewilderment and frustration over the Vietnam deadlock, it is not merely because our "illusion of omnipotence" has been shattered anew. It is because we have been subjected to an almost unsurpassed compound of misinformation and wishful thinking. This was not always the product of diabolical deceit; there have no doubt been many moments when some of the sources of befuddlement were merely articulating their own confusion or ignorance.

But the total effect has been scandalous. I do not happen to be one of those who lightly raise the cry of "managed news"; 2 years ago, in this magazine, I defended President Kennedy's resort to concealment in certain crucial hours preceding the Cuban confrontation. At the same time I also wrote that much of the press too often achieved maximum indignation over marginal issues and that it had been singularly lacking in outrage over the fashion in which the more diligent U.S. correspondents were being pushed around in South Vietnam. There has been mounting documentation of that story in the ensuing period; it is part of a

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$105,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 39) to study administrative practice and procedure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to address the Senate briefly with respect to Senate Resolution 39. Under this resolution, the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure would receive \$150,000, an increase in \$30,000 over last year.

This increase is to take care of the recent pay raise, plus funds to hire at least one additional specialist.

I would like to reiterate very briefly an explanation which was made to both the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Rules; there are at least three pieces of legislation of considerable importance which should be processed by this subcommittee.

The first is an overhaul of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946. It is this act which governs the operations of all of the regulatory bodies of the U.S. Government. It is generally conceded that the time and cost of proceedings before many of these bodies are excessive. Techniques have been proposed to improve this situation. These techniques will, of necessity, have to be drafted into the Administrative Procedure Act.

It is no exaggeration that the agencies which are governed by the Administrative Procedure Act regulate many, many billions of dollars of activities in the United States each year. Consider the regulatory activities of just a few of these agencies. The ICC, for example, handles over 10,000 cases per year dealing with all sorts of interstate transportation; or the Federal Power Commission, which regulates the generation and transmission of virtually all of the country's power. If the processes of such regulatory bodies could be improved and speeded up by as little as one-tenth of 1 percent, the amount of money spent in the legislative process to accomplish this end would be returned to the taxpayers, to industry, and to consumers, many, many times over.

In brief, if we can find ways to shorten the huge number of administrative proceedings, certainly millions of dollars will be saved annually.

A second subject matter with which the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure deals is the freedom of information legislation, which is of tremendous interest both to the public and to all news media. To put it mildly, it is a terribly complex and difficult subject. Last year, after a great deal of subcommittee and committee consideration, the Senate passed a bill (S. 1666) which, if enacted into law, would radically change and improve the rules relative to the availability of public information to the people.

The subject will be before the subcommittee this Congress, and I have been assured that considerable further effort will be spent to perfect a piece of legislation which can be enacted into law.

Third, the subcommittee has a piece of legislation with respect to the practice of lawyers before Federal agencies. This bill is of great interest to the American Bar Association and to all lawyers throughout the country.

In addition, this small subcommittee is investigating the broad subject of invasions of privacy by Government agencies. This is a very crucial, if difficult, investigation. This subject alone could easily take up the whole time and energy of the small staff of the subcommittee. It is because of the difficulty of this investigation that the subcommittee is asking; first, for a clarification of its jurisdiction to examine into the practices and; second, a modest increase in funds. Departments and agencies in their investigatory and law enforcement functions, and, second, a modest increase in funds. Senate Resolution 39 clarifies any doubt that the Committee on the Judiciary and its Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure is specifically authorized to examine into the practices and procedures of all Government departments and agencies in their law enforcement and investigatory functions, as well as their rulemaking, licensing, and adjudicatory functions. If there are such practices and procedures which are unnecessary or unwarranted invasions of the privacy of either Government employees or American citizens as a whole, such invasions should be brought out into the open and, where they exist, we should consider remedial legislation. I certainly hope that all Government departments and agencies will cooperate with the subcommittee in this important investigation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 39) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 39

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study and investigation of administrative practices and procedures within the departments and agencies of the United States in the exercise of their rulemaking, licensing, investigatory, law enforcement, and adjudicatory functions, including a study of the effectiveness of the Administrative Procedure Act, with a view to determining whether additional legislation is required to provide for the fair, impartial, and effective performance of such functions.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so

fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$150,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES—RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 40) to investigate antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that this resolution be passed over temporarily, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the next one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

The resolution (S. Res. 43) to investigate matters pertaining to constitutional rights was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$195,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO GOVERNMENT CHARTER, HOLIDAYS AND CELEBRATIONS

The resolution (S. Res. 41) to consider matters pertaining to Government charter, holidays, and celebrations was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 41

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to consider all matters pertaining to Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$7,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEMS

The resolution (S. Res. 45) to study and examine the Federal judicial celebrations was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a study and examination of the administration, practice, and procedures of the Federal judicial system with a view to determining the legislation, if any, which may be necessary or desirable in order to increase the efficiency of the Federal courts in the just and expeditious adjudication of the cases, controversies, and other matters which may be brought before them.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis professional, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments and agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 44) to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I notice that there were 1,002 private immigration and naturalization bills filed during the previous Congress, and that 450 were disposed of, including 295 which were reported favorably, and 155 which were definitely postponed.

Why were not the rest of them considered? Was it that they were not worthy of consideration?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, where there are administrative remedies, we do not pass the bill. The staff has to study the bill in order to determine whether there is an administrative remedy available.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is why they were held over.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct. I am informed that a number of them will be taken care of.

Mr. ELLENDER. However, they were all looked into?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an explanation printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Resolution 44 provides funds to the extent of \$162,000 to maintain the standing Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization for the period beginning February 1, 1965, through January 31, 1966.

The expenditure of funds under Senate Resolution 44 is made necessary by the continuing heavy workload of the subcommittee, which may be attributed to the large number of private immigration bills and adjustment of status cases which are referred to the subcommittee; the numerous general immigration and nationality bills referred to the subcommittee for action; and the innumerable routine items relating to immigration problems.

During the 88th Congress, these were referred to the subcommittee a total of 1,002 private immigration bills. Of this number 450 were disposed of, leaving 552 cases pending at the close of the 88th Congress. Many private bills are indefinitely postponed because the committee has a general policy of disapproving private bills in cases where an administrative remedy appears to be available. In this type of case, the subcommittee staff assists the Senator's office in working out the administrative remedy for the alien involved.

There were referred to the subcommittee 23 general immigration and naturalization bills during the 88th Congress, which were pending before the subcommittee at the time of the adjournment of the 88th Congress. Public hearings were held on the several bills to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act. During the 4 days of hearings, testimony was received from congressional sponsors of the proposed legislation and from the

Secretary of State. In addition, numerous statements were received for the record.

There are numerous instances under the immigration laws where the Attorney General is granted discretionary authority to waive certain provisions of the law, but in such cases he is required to submit detailed reports of his action to the Congress. During the 88th Congress, there were submitted to the Congress 7,849 such cases. All reports of the orders issued by the Attorney General are referred to the subcommittee where they are carefully checked to see that the discretionary action is being exercised in conformity with the intent of the Congress.

Under the immigration laws, the Attorney General is empowered to adjust the status of certain deportable aliens, certain aliens who entered the United States in a diplomatic or semidiplomatic status, and certain aliens in a refugee category, to that of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence, subject to congressional approval. At the close of the 88th Congress, 938 such cases remained pending.

During the 88th Congress, there were referred to the subcommittee 6,411 complete and detailed statements in cases in which the Attorney General paroled into the United States certain refugee-escapees as authorized in section 1 of Public Law 86-648. Each such case must be carefully checked to see that this special parole authority is being exercised in conformity with the intent of the Congress. In addition, during the 88th Congress, there were referred to the subcommittee 8,836 reports in cases where the Attorney General had approved first preference petitions.

The subcommittee also has an extensive workload by referral items from Senators' offices and correspondence which cannot be statistically appraised.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 44) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$162,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Unwittingly perhaps, we have abused this ordinary citizen who has responded to the appeals to his patriotism and bought these familiar Government obligations. Large investors do not go into E-bonds; as a matter of fact we limit the amount that can be bought in any year. The Treasury Department tells me that 60 percent of these bonds are sold through payroll savings plans.

Since 1940 the dollar has lost 55 cents through erosion of its purchasing power, and 43 cents since 1945. In the past 10 years the loss has been 14 cents. But that is not bad enough, paying back depreciated dollars for whole ones invested. When the inevitable emergency arises and the long-held bonds are cashed, the accumulated income dissipates under the impact of the accumulated income tax. Had he been more sophisticated, the little bondholder could have bought municipal bonds and avoided the tax bite. But with E bonds, we pay him back in deteriorated currency, and normally tax all his income at once.

It is in the Government's interest to sell as many of these E-bonds as it can. It is in the Government's interest to have the purchasers hold them until maturity. It is also in the Government's interest to treat the little purchaser fairly so that he will value the Government's word and honor its obligations. My bill should help on all these counts. Its cost in lost revenue is estimated at \$100 million, which is small compared to the excise tax cuts which are being considered to reduce the burden on purchasers of many items, including luxuries. I realize that there no longer seems to be a public policy of encouraging thrift, but even those officials whose careers are built on public borrowing should see the desirability of encouraging the purchasers of Government bonds.

LEGISLATION TO ASSIST TAXPAYERS BECAUSE SUFFICIENT FUNDS WERE NOT WITHHELD FROM THEIR PAYCHECKS

(Mr. PIRNIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to assist the thousands of taxpayers who, through no fault of their own, now find themselves in a most difficult position because sufficient funds were not withheld from their paychecks during the past year to meet their Federal income tax obligations.

As the April 15 deadline for filing Federal tax returns nears, I fully expect that every Member of this great body will be receiving a considerable amount of protest mail from unsuspecting constituents who have discovered that they owe much more in Federal income taxes than anticipated.

The bulk of the letters would not be from what I refer to as the hard-core tax complainers who want all the many services provided by the Federal Government, but do not want to pay their share for them. They will be from solid, upstanding citizens—your neighbors and mine—

who recognize their obligations and are conscientious about meeting them.

The much-publicized recent tax cut was passed because many of us felt that it would prove to be the stimulant needed to "beef up" the economy. Since the President gave Congress his assurance that he would make every effort to reduce Federal spending, an assurance that we demanded before we would give our approval to the measure, I voted for the bill because I could envision the good that would undoubtedly come from it.

However, at that time, many of us warned that there should not be an immediate drastic cut in the withholding rate. We said, and rightly so, that the cuts should be gradual and that the American public should be fully informed as to the procedure being followed and the probable result. Unfortunately, perhaps because of the then-pending presidential election, this advice was not heeded. Now, it is the innocent taxpayer who is suffering the consequences.

As we all know, the full reduction in the withholding tax rate was put into effect immediately whereas the tax cut itself was not handled in the same manner, but rather in two stages. What has resulted is that Mr. Average Taxpayer, accustomed either to getting a small refund or of paying a few dollars to meet his total tax obligation, now finds that he will have to pay several hundred dollars to the Internal Revenue Service because of the underwithholding.

It is not just a few people who will find themselves in this hole. The situation is so widespread that many finance companies are placing large advertisements in the newspapers in an effort to attract to their place of business the many individuals who will be borrowing funds to meet their tax obligation.

Clearly, if something can be done to assist these people, we should do it. The measure that I have introduced will give these taxpayers temporary relief by permitting them to defer payment of one-half of their remaining 1964 tax obligation until April 15, 1966. Because of the ever-increasing Federal expenditures, the occasion seldom arises in which we can give American taxpayers a break. Here is our opportunity. They deserve this break, and I believe that we should give it to them.

Bill
CLEVELAND IMMIGRATION
HEARINGS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 20, 1965, I provided an opportunity for interested organizations and individuals in Greater Cleveland to express their views on the major issues related to pending immigration legislation. A public hearing was held in the Cleveland Federal Building to which I invited public officials, the leaders of the major religious faiths, the officers of interested organizations, and the public at large. To assist in crystalizing the major issues involved, I prepared a 10-point

questionnaire which was mailed in advance to all individuals requesting an opportunity to appear at the hearing.

In addition, copies of the questionnaire were mailed in advance to the following elements of community leadership requesting cooperation in the survey:

First. The press, including foreign language and weekly community newspaper editors.

Second. Immigration committees of two bar associations.

Third. Leaders of organized labor.

Fourth. Selected leaders of the business community.

Fifth. Leaders of nationality organizations.

Sixth. Women's organizations.

Seventh. Selected individuals based upon their publicly expressed interest in immigration.

Mr. Speaker, I point out that none of this activity was at Government expense. The public hearing in Cleveland was intended to provide me with the views of my constituents and those of recognized leaders in the greater Cleveland community on this vital public issue. All costs involved, including mailing, printing, and the expenses of my staff members who accompanied me to Cleveland were borne by me personally.

The results of that hearing and the enthusiastic response to the questionnaire are both revealing and encouraging. Returns of the questionnaire have now exceeded 90 percent and the results are confirmatory of the testimony taken in the public hearing of February 20, 1965.

In my judgment, greater Cleveland is reflective of the majority of the metropolitan centers of our country. It represents a cross section of the people who have built our country and whose hopes, ideals, and aspirations sustain us in these troubled times.

The results of the questionnaire survey pointed at the major issues are as follows:

The first question was whether there should be a limit to the number of immigrants we admit each year. This is pertinent because under the present law and the pending proposal of the administration, there is no limit set on the number of immigrants to be admitted—89 percent held there should be a limit set while 11 percent held no limit should be set.

The second question was whether the present rate of 300,000 immigrant admissions a year was about right, too high, or too low. This is pertinent because there is disagreement on how many immigrants we should admit each year and many people hesitate to estimate how many we can assimilate at this advanced stage of our national development—55 percent held that the present rate is about right, 13 percent felt it was too high and 32 percent held it was too low.

The third question was whether Congress should set the limit by law on the number of immigrants we admit. This is pertinent because as I have said previously neither the present law nor the pending administration proposals sets a limit. Further, Congress is responsible

for regulating immigration into the United States and thereby has responsibility for quantitative as well as qualitative controls—79 percent held that Congress should set a limit by law on immigration admission while 21 percent felt Congress should not set a limit by law.

The fourth question was whether the President should be delegated authority to decide the limit and how visas should be distributed between countries and classes of aliens. This is pertinent because the pending administration proposal calls for a delegation of this authority from the Congress to the President—64 percent held that Congress should not delegate that authority while 36 percent felt Congress should so delegate. Among the 36-percent group there were a number who qualified their answer with such statements as, "to meet emergencies only," or, "to cut down when unemployment is high," and similar qualifiers.

The fifth question was a multiple choice type, between preferences which should regulate issuance of visas. Five choices were offered with the request they be marked 1 to 5 based on priority to be given. This is pertinent because there is disagreement as to what criteria should be used to determine how visas should be allocated among the various classes of aliens applying for admission. Here 67 percent held that relatives of U.S. citizens should have first preference while only 10 percent felt Communist oppression should have first preference while only 10 percent felt skilled workers should have first preference. The other choices, relatives of aliens living in the United States, and semiskilled workers were not rated as a first preference by any of the respondents. Further details on the breakdown of this multiple-choice question are appended to my remarks.

The sixth question was whether the individual receiving the questionnaire was aware that nonquota immigrant visas had doubled quota immigrant visas during the past 10 years. This is pertinent because of the public confusion on quota immigration and the popular but false belief that the quota system regulated immigration into the United States—63 percent stated they were not aware of the fact that nonquota immigration has doubled quota immigration while 37 percent said they were aware of this fact.

The seventh question was whether the national origins quota system should be repealed or retained in law. This is pertinent because President Johnson has called for repeal as the basic and overriding purpose of his message to Congress for immigration reform—88 percent held for repeal and 12 percent for retention of the national origins quota system.

The eighth question was whether we should continue open and unrestricted immigration by natives of countries of the Western Hemisphere or whether

they should be treated like all other alien applicants for admission. This is pertinent for several reasons. First there is the basic question of discrimination. When the quota system was adopted 40 years ago, natives of countries of the Western Hemisphere were made nonquota; that is, except from the quota system based upon national origin. This exemption was based strictly on the accident of place of birth just as the limit set for quota countries is today criticized because of the controlling factor of accident in place of birth. President Johnson has called upon Congress to remove from the law those factors which prejudice an applicant for admission based upon the place where he was born or how he spells his name. Further, nonquota immigration from the Western Hemisphere has been averaging 110,000 admissions a year for the past 10 years, with the prospect that this figure will continue to rise in the years ahead—91 percent held that natives of countries of the Western Hemisphere who seek admission should be treated like all other alien applicants, while 9 percent favored a continuation of the present nonquota privileges. However, almost half of the 9 percent favoring a continuation of nonquota status qualified their reply by stating some special arrangement should be made for Canada.

The ninth question was whether there refugees we admit each year. This is should be a limit to the number of refugees we admit each year. This is pertinent because the administration proposal calls for broad authority from Congress to admit refugees under a questionable "parole" status, with no indication as to how many will be admitted and who specifically would qualify as a refugee. Further, there appears to be some reasonable concern that bona fide refugees might get lost in the maze of administrative determinations forecast by calm observers should Congress grant to the Attorney General this broad authority on refugee admissions—84 percent held that there should be a limit set on the number of refugees we admit while 16 percent favored no limit.

The 10th question was whether Congress should provide safeguards in law to prevent immigrants from competing for jobs which American workers can fill. This is pertinent because of present unemployment, our job retraining programs to help native Americans meet the demands of automation and the expressed concerns of rank-and-file workers, many among the unemployed, that newly arrived immigrants will compete with them for employment opportunities. Further, there are the concerns of native Americans who are now preparing themselves for skilled occupations and who will have their first real chance to compete on an equal basis for the better paying jobs—57 percent felt Congress should provide safeguards to prevent job competition from newly arrived immigrants, while 43 percent held that

Congress should not provide such safeguards.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that immigration reform is an emotionally charged public issue. The advocates of far-reaching reforms, though well intended, are frequently blind to the realities which Congress must face up to in meeting its obligation to regulate immigration into the United States. Moreover, I have found that very few of the reformers have a full grasp of the implications of the reforms they advocate. Similarly, opponents of any reform in the present program, though well intended, are frequently blind to the need to correct abuses and inequities which have "terminated" their way into the program over a period of years. Moreover, I have found that very few, if any, of the advocates of status quo have any clear conception of the manner in which their opposition to change is being used to prevent Congress from establishing an immigration policy based upon the governing directives of clear-cut law.

To illustrate my point, I offer these rather elementary examples:

Those who oppose the national origins quota system have been molded into advocates of open and largely unrestricted immigration. I do not charge they are aware of their predicament, I only state the reality of their position.

Those who advocate maintaining the national origins quota system have been molded into opponents of reasonable efforts to establish a selective immigration policy with both quantitative and qualitative controls, under directives of law which recognize the practical demands of life in the United States in the 1960's. The irony is that those who fight for a status quo in the immigration field are in fact fighting for an extension of nonquota immigration which means a policy of open and unrestricted immigration. I do not charge that all advocates of the status quo are aware of their predicament, I only state the reality of their position.

Mr. Speaker, because of the interest expressed by many Members of Congress in the questionnaire I utilized to canvass opinion on the major issues related to pending immigration legislation, I include a copy of the form used together with a tabulation of the replies thereto:

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CLEVELAND HEARINGS

1. Should there be a limit to the number of immigrants we admit each year? Yes, 89 percent. No, 11 percent.
2. We are now admitting approximately 300,000 immigrants each year. Do you think this number is: About right, 55 percent; too high, 13 percent; too low, 32 percent.
3. Should Congress set the limit by law on the number of immigrants we admit? Yes, 79 percent. No, 21 percent.
4. Should the President be delegated authority to decide the limit and how visas are to be distributed between countries and classes of aliens? Yes, 36 percent. No, 64 percent.
5. Approximately 1 million alien applicants for admission are now pending. Among these, whom do you feel should have preference (list in order of priority, 1 to 5):

[In percent]

Choice	1st prefer- ence	2d prefer- ence	3d prefer- ence	4th prefer- ence	5th prefer- ence
Relatives of U.S. citizens.....	67	29	6	0	0
Skilled workers.....	10	30	30	33	0
Relatives of aliens living in United States.....	0	18	34	31	19
Semiskilled workers.....	0	4	7	22	70
Victims of Communist persecution.....	23	19	23	14	11
Total.....	100	100	100	100	100

6. Were you aware that during the last 10 years nonquota immigrant visas (1,774,367) have doubled quota immigrant visas (948,344)? Yes, 37 percent. No, 63 percent.

7. Do you favor repeal, 88 percent, or retention, 12 percent, of the national origins quota system?

8. Should natives of countries of Western Hemisphere who wish to immigrate to the United States:

(a) Have open, unrestricted admission? 9 percent.

(b) Be treated like all other alien applicants for admission? 91 percent.

9. Should there be a limit to the number of refugees we admit each year? Yes, 84 percent. No, 16 percent.

10. Should Congress provide safeguards in law to prevent immigrants from competing for jobs which American workers can fill? Yes, 57 percent. No, 43 percent.

Name.....
Address.....

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCLODY. I want to compliment the gentleman on the very full and illuminating statement with regard to the subject of immigration. I recognize that the gentleman as chairman of the important Subcommittee on Immigration has an extremely important task before him in this session of the Congress. I would like to ask the gentleman with respect to the subject of hearings on legislation because I know that I and other Members are getting a great deal of mail on the subject. What is the schedule with regard to the hearings on the administration bill or other legislation on the subject of immigration?

Mr. FEIGHAN. In the latter part of January or early February, I took the floor and made an announcement that hearings would commence on February 16. But I was unable to have the hearings because the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], scheduled hearings for the full committee on the subject of the presidential inability, and I had to wait until there was an opportunity to hold hearings which would not interfere with the full committee. So that the first hearing is scheduled for tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock in the committee room of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. The first witness will be the Attorney General, Mr. Katzenbach. We hope to proceed as expeditiously as possible with witnesses from the executive departments, from the operating level and then to organizations, voluntary agencies, and the public. Of course, we will have to have these hearings completed and we will probably have to set up a schedule which will require people to present their statements but to analyze them briefly so that we

will be able to interrogate them and so eventually get these hearings concluded.

Mr. McCLODY. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to inquire why the gentleman has to incur personal expenses in connection with this questionnaire and travel? I did not understand exactly what it was, but I understood the gentleman to say that he had to incur personal expenses which, it seems to me, is unfortunate if that is the case.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I was interested in securing the views of my constituents and those of leadership elements of Greater Cleveland on the 10 major issues involved in pending immigration legislation. Accordingly I felt I should cover the costs involved from my personal funds.

Mr. McCLODY. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). The time of the gentleman has expired.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, today, March 2, 1965, is the 100th anniversary of 2 of the 20 standing committees of the House of Representatives—the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Banking and Currency. On March 2, 1865, just before the close of the Civil War, the House separated the appropriating and banking and currency duties from its oldest committee—the Committee on Ways and Means—and assigned them to the two new committees. While the occasion would not of itself engage the general attention of the House or the country, and while whatever is said here will quickly pass beyond recall, a 100th birthday is nonetheless something of a milestone. I therefore thought the occasion sufficient to permit a brief intrusion to make some fragmentary public notes about it, with perhaps some quick glimpses of background and highlights from the past.

The Committee on Appropriations is a comparative youngster to its progenitor, the Committee on Ways and Means, which dates from the beginning in 1789 as a select committee and from 1802 as a standing committee. And it is considerably younger than most of the other standing committees of the House.

THE EARLY PRACTICE

In the very earliest days of the House there was recognition of the need for

compartmentalization of the labors. Select committees were the usual organ through which investigations were made and legislation drawn and brought to the House, but with the inevitable increase in business the tendency was to a system of standing committees. The early reluctance to standing committees was evidently rooted in a general distrust of an entrenching influence; a select committee expired upon discharge of the particular assignment.

Until the Committee on Appropriations was created in 1865, all "general" appropriation bills were controlled in the House by the Committee on Ways and Means—also in charge of revenue measures and some other classes of substantive legislation. The rivers and harbors bill, first enacted as a separate bill in 1826, was outside the main appropriation pattern; it was not regarded as a "general" bill during this period and was then handled by the Committee on Commerce. It was made a general bill in 1879, and while it continued to be prepared in the legislative committee the rule required the bill to be submitted to the Committee on Appropriations for recommendation.

MULTIPLICITY OF BILLS

In the first years, a single general appropriation bill met the needs. The first bill, in 1789, appropriated \$639,000 and covered 13 lines of the printed statutes. Five years later, in 1794, the Army was supplied in a separate bill, then the Navy in 1799, and so on until in 1865 there were 10 bills passed over to the new Committee on Appropriations, not counting the deficiency bill or bills—Again, in addition to the rivers and harbors bill. Today, there are 12 general bills in addition to supplemental and deficiencies as required.

THE MONEY POWER

By all accounts, and understandably, the Committee on Ways and Means was the most powerful committee in Congress. It had initial jurisdiction of the two cardinal powers of taxation and appropriation. Public money is the motive power of government, the substance without which not even the smallest or most elementary function of government can find expression. The power of the purse is the one certain, undeniable, and continuous weapon at the disposal of the Congress for effective control of the branches of government. As one noted man wrote in the last century:

If our Republic were blotted from the earth and from the memory of mankind, and if no record of its history survived, except a copy of our revenue laws and our appropriation bills for a single year, the political philosopher would be able from these materials alone to reconstruct a large part of our history, and sketch with considerable accuracy the character and spirit of our institutions.

CREATION OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

But if in 1860 the Committee on Ways and Means was invested with great power and influence it was, by all accounts, also heavily laden with work. Reports relate the resistance of the committee to suggestions that its work be divided. The advent of civil war brought unprecedented additional work. It was said the committee labored days and nights, weekdays, and Sundays. Near the war's end, the

need for a separate committee on appropriations could apparently no longer be denied.

Accordingly, on March 2, 1865, in the closing days of the 2d session of the 38th Congress, the House adopted a resolution creating the Committee on Appropriations. The new committee—six Republicans and three Democrats—was appointed on December 11, 1865, in the 1st session of the 39th Congress, and first reported the general appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1867. By 1920, the number had grown to 21. It was changed that year to 35 and gradually increased to 50 by 1951 where it has since remained—30 majority, 20 minority, the largest in Congress; currently, the division is 34 majority, 16 minority.

One almost immediately notes several striking things about the debate that day here on the floor. Here was fundamental relocation of the custody of perhaps the mightiest of all legislative powers. Yet an air of quiet resignation seemed to prevail.

Most of the leading lights of the House who spoke on the measure expressed doubts about the wisdom of separating the expenditure function from the revenue function. Thaddeus Stevens, then chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and Republican leader in the House—and destined to become the first chairman of Appropriations—thought the proposition of doubtful propriety; that the twin subjects of income and outgo seemed to be very properly connected. But he also seemed indifferent to the change and said as much.

Garfield, later to become Appropriations chairman and President of the United States, favored the change. His expressed interest was one of economy; that the change would afford opportunity to more thoroughly examine the details and the necessity for the requests for appropriations. Another Member wanted the proposition modified to require the Appropriations Committee to submit its recommendations to the Committee on Ways and Means; otherwise, he said, "there might be a year when the appropriations would exceed very largely the amount provided to carry on the Government."

But the plea of an overburdening load of work prevailed—as indeed seemed foreordained. It was as though to say, "It is not logical but it must be done." Remarkably, the change was adopted without even a record vote.

In presenting the resolution on the proposition, Mr. Cox of Ohio had this to say:

The proposed Committee on Appropriations have, under this amendment, the examination of the estimates of the departments, and exclusively the consideration of all appropriations. I need not dilate upon the importance of having hereafter one committee to investigate with nicest heed all matters connected with economy. The tendency of the time is to extravagance in private and in public. We require of this new committee their whole labor in the restraint of extravagant and illegal appropriations.

THE GROWTH OF EXPENDITURES

Some partial measure of the enormous multiplication of burdens arising from the Civil War can be gleaned from the

trend of expenditures. For several years prior to the onset, expenditures had ranged in the 60 millions of dollars; in fiscal 1860, the total was \$63,130,598. They reached the high point of \$1,297,555,224 in fiscal 1865 and receded sharply to \$520,809,417 in fiscal 1866.

In the first year for which the new Committee on Appropriations reported the general bills, fiscal 1867, total expenditures of the Government were \$357,542,675. In the ensuing 100 years the lowest expenditure level was \$236,964,327—in fiscal 1878. Subsequently, the general trend of appropriations has been ever upward. The Spanish-American War period marked the high point for the remainder of the century; in fiscal 1899, expenditures reached \$605,072,179, but by 1902 had dropped back to \$485,234,249. From there on, as the country grew and the Government embraced more functions and endeavors, expenditures gradually rose. With the onset of World War I, expenditures again crossed the billion-dollar line in fiscal 1917, reached a war peak of \$18,514,879,955 in fiscal 1919, and receded by fiscal 1927 to the lowest subsequent level; namely, \$2,974,029,674.

In the pending budget for fiscal 1966, administrative budget expenditures are tentatively projected at the record level of \$99,687,000,000; including so-called trust funds, such as social security, the tentative consolidated cash budget expenditure estimate for 1966 is \$127,400,000,000.

COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

Just a few words about the men who have guided the committee. Twenty-four men including the present incumbent, served as chairman; five of them served terms of broken continuity. The late Honorable Clarence Cannon, of Missouri, served as chairman nearly 19 years, almost twice as long as did "Uncle Joe" Cannon, of Illinois, who ranks second in that respect with 10 years. The Honorable John Taber, of New York, holds the distinction of longest service on the committee—40 years, consecutive, beginning with his entry upon service in the House.

Like all mortals, these men were possessed of both virtues and shortcomings. It may fairly be said that some were more illustrious than others. Several went on to higher or other important offices. One became President. Three achieved the speakership of the House. Three went to the other body. One became Governor of his State. The list of distinctions is long. Interesting biographical sketches of 21 of the men are in House Document No. 299 of the 77th Congress.

THE FIRST STORMY 20 YEARS

Ironically, the new Committee on Appropriations, created to relieve the overload of burdens upon the Committee on Ways and Means, itself soon began to experience a mountainous load—in a sense probably some was self-imposed. And it required little time to become thoroughly unpopular.

Woodrow Wilson described the Congress in the decades following the Civil War as "the central and predominant power of the system". The new Com-

mittee on Appropriations in this period was led by strong men, especially such as Stevens, Garfield, Randall, and Cannon of Illinois.

The new committee was diligent in its business. The record suggests that it took seriously the mandate to devote its efforts to restraint of extravagant and illegal appropriations. In fiscal 1867, the national debt as \$2,650,168,000—\$71 per capita. There followed 26 years of an almost unbroken record of reduction in the debt. There was a surplus every year and by fiscal 1893, the debt was down to \$961,431,000—about \$14 per person.

But the genesis of the committee's unpopularity was not bottomed solely on bare economy in appropriations. The disposition to graft legislation on appropriation bills long preceded the creation of the Committee on Appropriations; there was much complaint that this practice impinged on the work of the legislative committees for many years before 1865. But it may be that the practice was intensified after that date.

It was charged that the Committee on Appropriations had legislated in the very first appropriation bill it reported.

To complaints that the committee had changed laws in the appropriation bills in 1876, Chairman Randall compiled a "Statement showing in brief synopsis instances of independent legislation upon appropriation laws during the years 1865-75." It was an extensive list involving virtually every bill.

Then, in 1876, substantially the present form of the "Holman rule"—so-called from the name of its author, Chairman Holman—was adopted and employed from 1876 to 1885. All authorities seem to agree that the committee's construction of, and practices under, this rule, admitting germane legislation on the appropriation bills if it retrenched expenditures, fanned the flames of jealousy, sowed the seeds of resentment, and helped lay the groundwork for the soon-to-come contest for division of the Committee on Appropriations.

Writing only 14 years after the committee was formed, Garfield elucidated the problem. He said the practice, "involving a great mass of general legislation", had so overloaded the committee as to prevent sufficient attention to the appropriations proper. And he prophetically remarked that continuance of the rule would likely result in a dispersal of the bills to several committees, thereby precluding consideration and disposition of the appropriations business in accord with any general and comprehensive plan. The handwriting was already on the wall.

In House Document No. 246 of the 87th Congress, "History of the House of Representatives," page 158 et cetera, Galloway recites a number of restrictive fiscal developments of the period which, doubtless, also fostered resentment and opposition in the executive departments. Executive discretion was severely circumscribed by more detailed itemization of appropriations in the annual bills. Power to transfer funds between objects and purposes—a matter of executive-legislative contention from the earliest days—was repealed. Unexpended balances—often obscured or held incognito for later

March 18, 1965

revenues and accelerating local needs—must supply the remainder of the funds.

At a minimum, I see no reason to limit Federal participation to less than that authorized under existing State programs. If our efforts at the Federal level are to be successful, we should make assistance large enough to be of realistically available value to harried local communities. As the program now stands, some local units of government, desirous as they are of Federal help for open lands, just cannot find the necessary 60 or 70 percent to contribute to the cost of the land.

Moreover, Mr. President, I see no reason why Federal funds should pay 75 percent of the cost of the work in wildlife restoration projects or 50 percent of the development of local airport facilities, when only 20 to 30 percent is available to preserve our open space.

For these reasons, I propose that the 20 to 30-percent limitation be changed to allow a 50-percent Federal contribution to the open-space land program. In this way, many many more localities, especially under progressive State programs, will be able to participate in the open spaces program and take full advantage of the Federal Government's helping hand.

In addition, I wish to amend the 1961 housing act so that these 50 percent Federal grants can be made available for the improvement, rather than just the initial acquisition, of these acres of green land. As the program now operates, many communities are literally "stuck" with large undeveloped tracts of urban land due to their inability to secure funds for further improvement.

Thus, these communities are barred from turning barren scrubland into a delightful park or from providing certain improvements so that natural scenic vistas could be viewed and appreciated by all.

Under my proposed amendment, Federal funds would pay up to 50 percent of the cost of acquiring and improving land for appropriate open-space uses. This change is a realistic one, which simply recognizes that private funds can't find more profitable uses than the development of nonprofit recreational projects.

It also recognizes that the local governmental units, especially the small ones, have a difficult enough time providing the absolute bare minimums in public service such as education and police protection.

In short, I think these amendments to the open spaces bill will aid in our task of building "a community for the enrichment of the life of man." As President Johnson explained it in his recent housing message:

Our task is to put the highest concerns of our people at the center of urban growth and activity. It is to create and preserve the sense of community with others which gives us significance and security, a sense of belonging and of sharing in the common life.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1577) to authorize assistance under title VII of the Housing Act of 1961 for the development for open-space uses of land acquired under such

title, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. NELSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT (AMENDMENT NO. 56)

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to S. 500, the bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act. The amendment I submit today would restore to Bermuda and other adjacent islands nonquota status for purposes of immigration.

From 1921 to 1934 adjacent islands were not included among those countries upon which we imposed quota restrictions. These islands were, in fact, treated similarly to the independent countries of the Western Hemisphere. In 1924 these adjacent islands, including Bermuda, the Bahamas, the Netherlands Antilles, Barbados, and Port au Spain were given subquota status under their home governments.

Times and political climates have changed since 1924. Cuba enjoys a non-quota status now while these friendly islands must, insofar as immigration to the United States is concerned, continue to work with severe restrictions.

Mr. President, I submit that this situation is unfair, serves no purpose of ours and should be remedied.

I want to assure the Senate that this amendment will not cause large numbers of people to begin to immigrate into the United States. The total population of all of the islands which would be included in this amendment barely exceeds 1 million people. This amendment merely seeks to offer to the people of these islands the same privileges enjoyed by the rest of their neighbors. I do not believe it would stretch a point or strain our relations with Great Britain, the Netherlands or any other country to remove the present restrictions.

Mr. President, I request that this amendment lie on the table for 10 days so other Senators may join in cosponsoring it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

The amendment (No. 56) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENFORCEMENT OF 15TH AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 57)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTION

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] may be added to my bill, the Human Investment Act of 1965, S. 1130, as cosponsors, and that their names may be included among the list of Senators who are cosponsors at the next printing of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 1180) introduced by the senior Senator from Connecticut on February 18, to amend the Federal Firearms Act, the name of the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] be added as a cosponsor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, also on behalf of the senior Senator from Connecticut, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the resolution (S. Res. 30), to amend the standing rules of the Senate relative to the Select Committee on Small Business, the name of the senior Senator from Connecticut be added as a cosponsor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS RELATING TO HOUSING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I should like to announce that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee will begin hearings on March 29, 1965, on S. 1354, the President's 1965 housing bill, and other measures pending before the subcommittee. The hearings, expected to last 2 weeks, will be held in room 5302, New Senate Office Building, and will commence at 10 a.m. each day.

The following is a list of bills which are presently pending before the subcommittee and which will be included in the hearings: S. 506, S. 519, S. 712, S. 786, S. 946, S. 1182, S. 1183, S. 1354, and S. 1532.

Persons wishing to testify on these measures should contact Mrs. Dixie T. Lamb, Housing Subcommittee, room 5228, New Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS, ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I wish to announce that further hearings will be held by this subcommittee on the question of reapportionment of State legislatures. Dates for these hearings are April 1, 2, 6, 7, and 13, 1965. I would like to note that these hearings will be held in room

March 18, 1965

2226, New Senate Office Building, the Judiciary Committee hearing room, beginning at 10 a.m.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 18, 1965, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled joint resolutions:

S. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the week of May 2 through May 8, 1965, as "Professional Photography Week"; and
S. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution for Bennett Place commemoration.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. CASE:

Excerpts from remarks by Frederick H. Graef, president of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, dealing with efforts of New Jersey citizens in connection with their recent visit to Alagoas, Brazil, pursuant to the Partners for the Alliance program.

By Mr. COTTON:

Article on the financing of commercial supersonic transport aircraft, published in Aviation Week & Space Technology for February 8, 1965.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Article entitled "Weston Man Is State's Most Dedicated Tourist Promoter," published in the Clarksburg (W. Va.) Exponent, January 29, 1965.

By Mr. THURMOND:

Article entitled "Demonstrators Win Biggest Victory," written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Evening Star of March 17, 1965.

Article entitled "The Great Risk of the Great Society," written by Dr. Felix Morley and published in Nation's Business for March 1965.

Article entitled "The Phony Peace Drive," written by Thurman Sensing, executive vice president of the Southern States Industrial Council.

Article on participation by clergy in demonstrations at Selma, Ala., written by Rev. Charles B. Nunn, Jr., and published in The Light for March 12, 1965.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

Article entitled "The Self-Renewing City," published in the January-March 1965 issue of the General Electric Forum.

By Mr. PROUTY:

Letter to him dated March 1, 1965, from National Federation of Independent Business, reporting result of nationwide poll on Senate Resolution 30, to provide legislative authority for Senate Select Committee on Small Business.

RESOLUTION OF COUNCIL OF CITY OF SAN JOSE, CALIF., REQUESTING PRESIDENT TO ENFORCE FEDERAL LAWS IN SELMA, ALA.— RESOLUTION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Council of the City of San Jose, Calif., by unanimous vote, adopted a resolution on March 8, expressing its indignation at the recent convulsions and violence in Selma, Ala., and calling upon the Presi-

dent of the United States to take such action as to prevent similar outrages from occurring in the future. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be set forth in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RESOLUTION 27090

Resolution of the Council of the City of San Jose requesting the President of the United States to enforce Federal laws in Selma, Ala.

Whereas the citizens of the city of San Jose, Calif., have been alarmed and deeply concerned by the brutal and senseless police action against certain other American citizens in the city of Selma, Ala.; and

Whereas there is existing Federal legislation which could be enforced to insure to our fellow countrymen the right of peaceful assembly and the right to participate in self-government through the power to vote: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of San Jose, That the President of the United States be requested to take action to stop the outrageous mistreatment of American citizens by misguided local and State officials in the State of Alabama, and to assure that the constitutional rights of all citizens in all States are protected at all times.

J. L. PACE, M.D., Mayor.

Attest:

FRANCIS L. GREINER,

City Clerk.

By ROY H. HUBBARD,
Deputy.

CORRECTIONS OF THE RECORD

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the daily Record for March 16, 1965, at page 5080, in announcing the results of vote No. 37, contains an error which I think should be corrected. The Record now reads "so the amendments offered by Mr. CLARK and Mr. MURPHY were rejected en bloc."

It should read "so the amendments offered by Mr. PROUTY and Mr. MURPHY were rejected en bloc."

I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record be changed accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). The correction will be made.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the daily Record for February 17, 1965, at page 2703 contains an error in the recording of my remarks. The Record reads:

The maximum amount of the credit, however, would not exceed \$25,000 plus 1 1/4 percent of the training expenses in excess of \$25,000.

The Record should read:

The maximum amount of the credit, however, would not exceed \$25,000 plus 25 percent of the tax liability in excess of \$25,000.

I ask that this correction may be made in the permanent Record when it is printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The correction will be made.

TRIBUTE TO GUY JOHNSON, JR.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, an example of Maine initiative and ingenuity at its best is the project of Guy Johnson, Jr., of Great Island, Maine, a neighbor of mine. He is developing a Maine shrimp industry which promises to give Louisiana some competition. I hope

that some day I will be able to provide the Members of the Senate with this delicacy of Maine.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record at this point an excellent article on this project, by Richard Taylor, in one of Maine's outstanding newspapers, the Brunswick Record, and specifically the issue of February 18, 1965.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NEW SHRIMP PEELER HELPS KEEP FISHING FLEET BUSY

(By Richard Taylor)

HARPSWELL.—Shrimps, once considered a delicacy to be savored only in hot sauce, may be a common product of the sea on your table in the near future if plans conceived by Guy Johnson, Jr., of Great Island, materialize. The knotty problem of separating this delicacy from its shell has been overcome by automated machines and no longer does the housewife get sore fingers in preparing this food.

The automatic shrimp peeling machine in operation at Shrimp Lab Inc., at Great Island, takes an average of 2 minutes plus to process a shrimp ready for packaging and shipping to market. More than 25,000 pounds of this seafood has been shipped from this new sea processing plant with an estimated 100,000 pounds scheduled for next season.

This operation has given a shot in the arm to local area fishermen with seven boats dragging shrimps for the machine. Other shrimp dealers are sending their catch over to the machine for processing, finding it easier than other methods being used. At an average 350 pounds per hour, this machine and process promises good pay and a market for many boats without work during long winter months.

NO EASY JOB

Shrimping is not an easy job. It involves rising at the cold early morning hour of 2 a.m., steaming 10 to 20 miles offshore to the shrimp schools and putting in a long day that can run to 16 hours of labor. Add winter weather, the uncertain bottom that tears a net to tatters, and it is easy to see why shrimping is not considered an easy job. Markets and shrimp runs will affect the future of this business; however, at the present time there are some 40 boats dragging in the offshore waters.

HOW LONG THE SHRIMP?

This new technique has raised some questions concerning the potential shrimp population. Will continued heavy dragging deplete this food supply? This is speculation. Although this Gulf of Maine shrimp is not related to the Louisiana shrimp, it has been many years since the first southern shrimp was dragged from the bottom for human consumption and there seems to be no depletion of the southern supply. Gulf of Maine shrimp are smaller, some gourmets think tastier, and range from Cape Cod north. They are also found along the shores of Norway, Finland, and Denmark. In Norway, as a table delicacy they command \$1.20 per pound in the American equivalent money.

WHY FEMALES?

One of the biggest handicaps in selling this product unpeeled has been the eggs on the shrimps. Shrimps are not male or female as commonly designated, being both at some phase of their cycle. At the time they are caught by the draggers off the Maine Coast, they are female with eggs to prove it. These eggs have no eye appeal to the bargain hunting housewife as she peers into the fish market. In fact, they look dirty and hardly worth the effort to make them edible. Peeled shrimp have a ready market.

April 22, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7959

His patience, his justice, his honesty, his sincerity conquered everyone who really knew him. Douglas, his rival in love, in the law, and in politics, pronounced him the honestest man he ever knew. Wendell Phillips, who bitterly assailed him because he was not an abolitionist, finally declared that he was "God given, God led, and God sustained." Seward, who at first thought lightly of him, lived to refer to him as a "man of destiny with character made and molded by divine power to save a nation," and Stanton, whose treatment of him when they first met was almost contemptuous, truly said, as the gentle spirit let the body, "Now he belongs to the ages." The rail splitter, the flatboat hand, had conquered them all, and the conquest was complete and enduring. [Applause.]

Our country has been abundantly blest in the fact that it owes everything to the common man, nothing to aristocracy or royalty. What an array of names—Columbus, Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln—all springing from the common people, but none of them quite so near the common clay as this child of the frontier, this—

"Kindly-earnest, brave, foreseeing man,
Sagacious, patient, dreading praise, not blame,
New birth of our new soil, this first American."

Truly does the poet say he was new birth of our new soil. Generations separated him from the ways and the amenities of cultivated society. He was so close to nature that, as another poet well says of him:

"The color of the ground was in him—the red earth;
The tang and odor of the primal things;
The rectitude and patience of the rocks;
The gladness of the wind that shakes the corn;
The courage of the bird that dares the sea;
The justice of the rain that loves all leaves;
The pity of the snow that hides all scars;
The loving kindness of the wayside well;
The tolerance and equity of light that gives as freely to
The shrinking weed as to the great oak flaring in the wind—
To the grave's low mound as to the Matterhorn
That shoulders out the sky.

"And when the step of Earthquake shook the house,
Wrenching the rafters from their ancient hold,
He held the ridgepole up and spiked again
The rafters of the Home. He held his place—
Held the long purpose like a growing tree—
Held on through blame and faltered not at praise.
And when he fell in whirlwind, he went down
As when a kingly cedar green with boughs
Goes down with a great shout upon the hill,
And leaves a lonesome place against the sky."

Abraham Lincoln was the very incarnation of the spirit of democracy, of the rule of the common people. His thoughts were their thoughts, their joys were his joys, and their sorrows were his, too. His sad, deep-furrowed face was so marked with melancholy that he seemed to bear all the burdens of his people.

What a man, and what a career. Just look for a moment with the eyes of your imagination and behold this awkward, barefoot, backwoods boy at 10 trying to do a man's part in the woods with his ax; living in a forest hut entirely open on one side; at night dragging his tired frame to his attic nest of leaves by climbing on pegs driven into the logs, to find himself ere morning

sleeping under a coverlet of snow; walking miles to borrow a book and lying prone on the floor to read it by the light of the blazing pine knots; wading waist deep through the wintry waters of a creek to rescue a worthless dog; guiding a flatboat down the Mississippi; making rails to fence the little farm on the Sangamon for his father and step-mother before leaving them to make his own way in the world, before starting out at 22 on the quest for the road leading to that figurative ladder on which he was destined to climb so high. Again see him start from Springfield on a flatboat trip to New Orleans; see him find a way to extricate the stranded boat when older and more experienced men fail, just as later on, in affairs of greater moment, he always found a way; see him as grocer's clerk treating all with rigid, scrupulous honesty, walking 3 miles before breakfast to bring to a customer the modicum of tea which the accidental use of a wrong weight deprived her of the evening before; see him postmaster, with the mail in his hat, and see him laying away at the end of his term the very pennies which belonged to the Government, to be produced years afterwards when called on for a settlement. Step by step see him progress on the tollsome way, now storekeeper, now surveyor, soldier, politician, and lawyer, but ever and always faithful student, good citizen, and honest man. [Applause.]

Then see him arrive in Springfield at the age of 28, bringing with him little credit, and less money, and riding a borrowed horse. See him gradually rise, gaining steadily in public estimation. See him in the State legislature and in Congress, and when the question of slavery extension becomes acute see him challenge for a joint discussion his opponent for senatorial honors, the ablest debater of his day, Stephen A. Douglas, the little giant of the Prairie State. The whole civilized world knows the result of that debate.

Like a skillful general Lincoln so directed the course of the contest that he lost a skirmish in order to win a battle. He was beaten for the Senatorship only to gain the Presidency.

On May 18, 1860, he was nominated by the national convention of his party at Chicago, and duly elected in November. On the 11th of the following February he departed from his Springfield home never to return alive.

I can see in imagination the parting scene. In a pouring rain he stood bareheaded on the coach platform at the old Wabash depot and bade goodbye to his friends and neighbors. Listen to him:

"My friends, no one not in my situation can appreciate my feeling of sadness at this parting. To this place and the kindness of these people I owe everything. Here I have lived a quarter of a century, and have passed from a young man to an old man. Here my children were born, and one is buried. I now leave, not knowing when or whether ever I may return, with a task before me greater than that which rested upon Washington. Without the assistance of that Divine Being who ever attended him I cannot succeed. With that assistance I cannot fail. Trusting in Him who can go with me and remain with you and be everywhere for good, let us confidently hope that all will yet be well. To His care commending you, as I hope in your prayers you will commend me, I bid you an affectionate farewell." [Applause.]

How touching, how sincere, how full of faith in God. And the language itself—how rhythmic, how direct, how simple it is. Where did this man, who scarcely entered the schoolhouse and knew not the college or the university, get this magnificent, this perfect command of language? How and where and when did he master that elusive thing called style so thoroughly that some of his letters and speeches adorn the walls of great insti-

tutions of learning as specimens of perfect English? Let me read to you his letter to Mrs. Bixley, which both graces and adorns a wall of Oxford University as a specimen of perfect composition:

"DEAR MADAM: I have been shown in the files of the War Department a statement of the adjutant general of Massachusetts that you are the mother of five sons who have died gloriously on the field of battle. I feel how weak and fruitless must be any words of mine which should attempt to beguile you from a loss so overwhelming, but I cannot refrain from tendering you the consolation that may be found in the thanks of the Republic they died to save. I pray our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement, and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice on the altar of freedom." [Applause.]

His Gettysburg address is conceded to be the best short speech in the language, but short as it is and excellent as it is, I shall not now ask you to listen to it. Indeed, were I to indulge in quoting specimens of his eloquence, I should find no reasonable stopping place. I cannot, however, resist the impulse to quote the prophecy which concludes his first inaugural:

"I am loath to close. We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature." [Applause.]

And may I not also recite the hymn with which he closes his second inaugural?

"With malice toward none, with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan—to do all things which may achieve and cherish a just and a lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations." [Applause.]

What rhythm, what majesty, what patriotism.

If we did not know that his spare moments from boyhood up were given to the study of the Bible and to the companionship of Aesop and Bunyan and Defoe and Burns and Shakespeare, we might well exclaim as did the doctors and the scribes of old concerning Him who spake as man never spake, "Whence hath this man letters, having never learned?" But we know that his mastery of his native tongue, the only one he knew, did not come unsought. It was acquired by persistent and resolute effort, and was tinged and tempered by the tenderness of a nature filled with love for God and man and country. It reflected his patience, his fortitude, his fidelity, his absolute fairness and sense of justice, as well as his courage, sincerity, and resolution. In short, with him, as with every master of diction, the style bespoke the man.

Almost 47 years have come and gone since the fateful night when the hand of a poor deluded lunatic, without a moment's notice or a word of warning, struck him down. What a shock he gave the world and what a cruel wound he thus inflicted on the torn and bleeding Southland. By that blow he struck down the only man who had the strength and the will to stay the ruthless hands of those greedy and unscrupulous adventurers who, at the close of the war, promptly proceeded to plunder the stricken South. I give it as the opinion of his lifelong friends in Springfield that Lincoln never lost his love and sympathy for his native

April 22, 1965

Southland, and that had he lived he would never have permitted the reign of robbery and ruin which that fair land experienced in reconstruction days. The hand, the only hand, which had the strength to save them was paralyzed in death by one who vainly imagined he was aiding their cause.

As for Lincoln, it was far beyond the poor power of the assassin to rob him of one tittle of his fame. Indeed, he added the one thing needed, if anything were needed, to enshrine his memory forever in the hearts of the American people, and that was the martyr's crown. And for this he chose, most opportunely, the moment when his victim had reached the summit, nay, the very zenith of his fame.

The war was practically over. The dove of peace hovered over the land. The Union was saved. Government of the people, by the people, and for the people had not perished from the earth. The ship of state was safe at anchor. The shackles were struck from the limbs of 4 million slaves. And the people gave Lincoln credit for it all. The world was filled with the sound of his praises. His feet were on the topmost round of fame's ladder. Millions of his countrymen would cheerfully have laid down their lives to save his life. There was little glory left for him to gain, and then, lest he trip and stumble, fate closed and sealed the splendid record.

With what dramatic force Walt Whitman tells the pathetic story:

"O Captain! my Captain! our fearful trip is won.

The ship has weathered every rack, the prize we sought is won.

The port is near, the bells I hear, the people all exulting.

But Oh heart! heart! heart!

Oh the bleeding drops of red,

Where on the deck my Captain lies,

Fallen cold and dead.

"O Captain! my Captain! rise up and hear the bells;

Rise up—for you the flag is flung—for you the bugle thrills,

For you bouquets and ribboned wreaths—for you the shore's acrowding,

For you they call, the swaying mass, their eager faces turning;

Here Captain! dear father!

This arm beneath your head!

It is some dream that on the deck

You've fallen cold and dead.

"My captain does not answer, his lips are pale and still,

My father does not feel my arm, he has no pulse nor will,

The ship is anchored safe and sound, its voyage closed and done,

From fearful trip the victor ship comes in with object won!

Exult, Oh, shores, and ring, Oh, bells!

But I, with mournful tread,

Walk the deck my Captain lies

Fallen cold and dead."

In the very heyday of his fame he fell at the post of duty; and so we shall always think of him as he was at his best, not a single shadow, not a single blur, not a single flaw in the picture.

As the years file slowly past, as we get further and further away from his time and see him in clearer and truer perspective, his splendid moral and intellectual proportions, his patience, his fidelity, his sense of justice, his foresight, his charity, his patriotism—in a word his greatness—become more, and more apparent.

In a spirit of patriotic devotion, imbued with a feeling of profound gratitude for the blessing of a reunited country under the old flag, let us reverently bless God that He vouchsafed us such a captain to direct the ship of state at such a time. [Prolonged applause.]

SENATOR DIRKSEN'S RECORD ON IMMIGRATION LAWS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States provides for the right of citizens to petition their Government on any given subject. Many citizens and organizations literally flood Congress with petitions and letters which are seriously considered by Members of Congress when they are of merit. My office receives as much mail as any in Congress. Recently, there was a serious abuse of the right of petition when Mr. Joseph De Serto, secretary, Chicago chapter, American Committee on Italian Migration, rather than writing me directly for comment, inserted an open letter to me in *Fra Noi* in the April 1965 issue which was based on a false premise and would definitely mislead the readers who were extended an invitation by the newspaper to send the open letter to me with a notation, "These are my sentiments too," with the signature and address of the sender.

The open letter by Mr. De Serto was so written that it created inferences and innuendos which made it appear that I and some of my Republican colleagues in Illinois were against liberalized quotas and other provisions to amend our immigration laws, where Mr. De Serto knows—and so do all nationality groups interested in immigration know—of my record for liberalized immigration quotas as noted in my Senate bill, S. 2178—1959—which was killed in a Democratic controlled Congress.

It seems unnecessary for me, a son of immigrant parents, whose strong record in helping the passage of civil rights legislation in 1957, 1960, 1964, and 1965; whose continuous efforts to get passage of Senate resolutions of freeing captives behind the Iron Curtain as expressed in Senate Concurrent Resolutions 6 and 10, and whose strong activity in liberalized immigration bills, to enumerate my record as to favorable liberalized immigration laws, but I shall do so even though many nationality groups and religious faiths have honored me with plaques and citations for my efforts on immigration. For example, Mr. De Serto's organization had this to say on a bronze plaque which his organization gave me in 1958 which is prominently displayed in my office:

AWARD OF THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON ITALIAN MIGRATION NATIONAL CATHOLIC RESETTLEMENT COUNCIL, PRESENTED TO THE HONORABLE EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

In recognition of his dedication to the principles and ideals upon which America was founded; for outstanding contributions to the welfare of his fellow men; for championing the liberalization of our immigration laws and, particularly, for his many labors and selfless services which have furthered the migration, reception and resettlement of Italians in this country.

JUVENAL MARCHISIO,

National Chairman.

Rev. CAESAR DONANZAN, P.S.S.C.,

National Executive Secretary.

Given under the auspices of the Chicago ACIM chapter on the 16th day of February in the year of our Lord 1958.

The record shows that both the Displaced Persons Act—1948—and the Refugee Act—1953—were passed by a Republican-controlled Congress which en-

abled many Italian, Greek, Jewish, and other immigrants to come to America as displaced persons and refugees. I stand on my record on good and liberal immigration law amendments just as I stand on my record by introducing Senate Concurrent Resolution 6 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 10, in helping people all over the world who are captives behind the Soviet communistic Iron Curtain, in their efforts to become freemen and free nations again; and my record in advancing the cause of civil rights of all people regardless of their race, nationality, religion, or creed.

As the ranking Republican on the Senate Immigration Subcommittee and the Senate Judiciary Committee which have jurisdiction over immigration and naturalization and refugee matters, I shall always support appropriate immigration legislation.

I wish to assure all of the 40 groups who attend meetings of the Committee for a Fair U.S. Immigration Law, that my record on immigration is public for all to see.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of the immigration bills introduced by me in the Senate, together with a copy of the letter to which I have referred, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION INTRODUCED BY SENATOR DIRKSEN THE 85TH CONGRESS

January 7, 1957: S. 129, a bill to amend the act of September 3, 1954 (68 Stat. 1145), and for other purposes.

June 19, 1957: S. 2335, a bill to amend section 239 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

June 24, 1957: S. 2369, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

August 14, 1957: S. 2792, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes. (Supersedes S. 129 and S. 2369.) Became public law.

March 3, 1958: S. 3392, a bill to amend section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended—adjustment of status of Hungarian refugees for permanent residence.

THE 86TH CONGRESS

January 20, 1959: S. 504, a bill to amend section 239 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes. (Same as S. 2335, 85th Cong.)

June 15, 1959: S. 2178, a bill to amend titles I, II, and III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes (Eisenhower administration bill).

March 18, 1960: S. 3225, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to modernize and liberalize the quota system and provide for the admission of persecuted peoples, and for other purposes (Eisenhower administration's proposal to liberalize national origins quota system).

THE 87TH CONGRESS

May 4, 1961: S. 1809, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act.

July 12, 1961: S. 2237, a bill to permit the entry of certain eligible alien orphans—extension of the adoption orphan law.

I have introduced also many private immigration bills, most of which were enacted into law, to enumerate. I suppose my office handles as many individual immigration cases as any of the Senators from the larger States covering all phases of immigration difficulties.

April 22, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7961

AN OPEN LETTER

Subject: Immigration; Senate bill, S. 500;
House bill, H.R. 2580.

Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: As an American, descendant of a people from southeastern Europe, I must register a protest against the misinformation and half-truths being circulated by the enemies of any form of immigration to the United States.

Those people who preach a master race theory that the greatness of my country is due only to Anglo-Saxon Protestants forget that I know about such people as Christopher Columbus, Amerigo Vespucci, Cabot, Einstein, Fermi, La Salle, Lafayette, Salomon, Mazzel, Dubinsky, Teiler, Astor, Cudahy, and Pupin to mention only a few.

I am ready to give the Anglo-Saxon Protestants their due credit, but I believe the people mentioned above and the many thousands of others who were not of Anglo-Saxon Protestant heritage all contributed to the greatness of my country.

We fought a terrible and costly war to disprove the "master race" theory. Let's keep it out of our own boundaries.

"Let's not open the floodgates," scream others. Let them rave and rant—we know that the proposed bills will not increase the number of permitted entry under this law by more than 7,000 or 8,000—which is about a 5½ percent increase according to good old U.S.A. arithmetic.

"Labor is against it—it will create greater unemployment" is the claim of still others. Wrong. Labor is not against it as witness the statement of the AFL-CIO Executive Council on Immigration at its Bal Harbour, Fla., meeting on February 25, 1965.

With regard to the creation of more unemployment, we refer you to the article from the Wall Street Journal—"Severe labor shortage develops at many firms as the boom rolls on"—which was spread on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (p. A1009, Mar. 8, 1965) at the request of Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri.

We are sure, Senator, that you know the true facts. Can we count on your support and the prestige of your minority leadership to bring about a fair and equitable immigration law for which Americans can be proud?

Sincerely,

JOSEPH DE SERTO,
Secretary, Chicago Chapter, American
Committee on Italian Migration.

COOPERATION BETWEEN ARIZONA AND CALIFORNIA RELATIVE TO THE PROBLEM OF WATER SHORT- AGE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on Monday, April 12, I spoke before the annual meeting of the board of directors of the Southland Water Committee in the Biltmore Hotel in Los Angeles. Among other subjects I spoke on the growing problem of water shortage from the Colorado River. With great pride I pointed out that two great American States, Arizona and California, are working together for their common good. I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the text of my remarks on that occasion be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTIAL TEXT OF REMARKS BY U.S. SENATOR
THOMAS H. KUCHEL

Statuary Hall in our Nation's Capitol in Washington, D.C., holds the likeness in stone and bronze of the two most illustrious people

from each of our several States. Here stand the forms and figures of two giants of bygone days who trod this soil, and who live in history. One is that of Junipero Serra, lowly Franciscan friar, who brought Christianity to this land, who built our missions, and who early undertook to transform great tracts of semidesert lands into gardens, by ingenious and successful undertakings to conserve the precious waters, which, then as now, too infrequently fell from the sky. The other is that of Thomas Starr King, a Unitarian minister who, a century ago, saved California for the Union in the tormenting and bloody conflict between the States. In September 1862, Reverend King spoke before the San Joaquin Valley agricultural system in Stockton. He sketched, for those who gathered, the glories of our State. He spoke of "an artist's dream" of what California might look like a hundred years hence. In his mind's eye, he saw long ribbons of fields of grapes and grains—of houses grouped and hamlets booming—of villages with spires and cities of columns. He described the millions who would live here in 1962. But in all the dreams which Thomas Starr King dreamed that day in Stockton long ago, he could not have dreamed by the wildest stretch of his imagination, all the wonders of our State in the 1960's, of the fantastic and endless mass migration to our midst, bringing millions upon millions of new residents, to achieve an imposing leadership in agriculture, in industry, in business, in science, in transportation, in outer space, in education, in development, and human progress, which, all together, have made this State first in the Nation. In all our State's history down to today, the leaders of our communities have had a thirst for progress which has remained unslaked, and whose dreams for our future reach out to touch the moon and the stars.

As a Californian, as the son of a Californian, as a grandson of an immigrant who came here from across the seas to be a Californian, I have the same pride that is yours in what has been accomplished, and in what surely will be our constant forward march in the decades ahead.

From the very beginning a basic problem facing this arid land of ours has been water, mostly too little, occasionally too much. I mentioned what really were irrigation projects of Junipero Serra's time. Parts of them still remain near the mission in Santa Barbara. In the history of southern California, our growth has ever been controlled by our supply of water. There never has been any abundance. Our artesian wells, which I remember as a boy, are long since gone. Pumps have reached ever deeper in the ground. Salt water intrusion from the ocean has been a menacing problem for many of our coastal cities. Indeed, had it not been, since the 1870's, for the continuing importation of water from the great Colorado River, our growth would have been stunted, and our future would have been bleak. There would be no giant, Metropolitan Los Angeles as we know it, were it not for this water supply from beyond our State borders. Men who were leaders in this city in bygone days, to their infinite credit, planned for the future and carried their plans into reality. An epoch was reached for California in 1928 when that superb leader, the late, great Senator Hiram Johnson, was finally able to overcome embittered opposition, and to obtain passage of the bill authorizing construction of Hoover Dam. That massive people's project, with the water and the power which it supplies to Los Angeles and to the southland, represents, I think, the difference between economic life and death in our farflung empire south of the Tehachapi Mountains. This Federal water and power project and the hundreds of millions of dollars which the Federal Government has invested in it, almost all of which is being repaid by you and me who reap its

benefits, has underwritten southern California's burgeoning economy. It points the way to satisfying the future needs not alone of California but of the entire Pacific Southwest area as well.

I must add that north of the Tehachapi Mountains vast and vital Federal reclamation works, built and building, have brought economic viability and growth to the areas they serve. The Central Valley project has assured the future of our northern cities and towns. It has transformed barren lands into hundreds of thousands of lush agricultural acres and new communities. Water shortage is not a problem in the north. Rather it is a problem of water conservation and water control. All credit to the people of California, north and south, for the expenditures they have made, and the indebtedness they have readily assumed, to help plan for an expanded tomorrow. And all credit, too, to the Government of the United States whose repayable investments in multipurpose reclamation projects have opened new horizons for our people.

The story I have to tell today deals in the main with southern California, and the questions of an adequate future water supply to meet the needs of the additional millions of citizens who will live here with us as the years go by. It is the story in great part of the waters of the Colorado River which are being used, and will be used in greater quantity, by Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico, the so-called Upper Colorado River Basin States, and by Arizona, Nevada, and California, the so-called Lower Basin States, as well. They will continue to be used also by our neighbors in Mexico with whom we have a treaty obligation to furnish annually a usable supply.

The American States through which the river wends its way are tied together by an agreement, called the Colorado River Compact, which seeks equitably to divide the supply. The fact is, as the Upper Basin States develop their own necessary projects, the supply available to the lower basin will diminish. But, at the same time, California will need more water to sustain her growth. So, indeed, will Arizona, and Nevada, too. I think it a good rule of life that when you can help your neighbor, you should seek to do so, and that when you and your neighbor, working together, can help each other, without damaging either, there are two reasons to do so. In a word, that is the basis on which, at long last, Arizona and California came into an agreement this year.

I do not wish to burden my comments with statistics or by a discussion of complex legal questions and formulas. Suffice to say, that California, long ago, was required to place a ceiling on the amount of river water it would use as a prerequisite to the construction of Hoover Dam. The California Legislature in 1929 imposed a limitation of 4.4 million acre-feet of river water per year out of the first 7.5 million acre-feet available in the Lower Basin, plus one-half of any excess or surplus water over and above that amount.

In that connection, the U.S. Supreme Court decree, in *Arizona v. California*, holds that if sufficient mainstream water is available for release to satisfy 7.5 million acre-feet of annual consumptive use, the waters shall be apportioned 4.4 million to California, 2.8 million to Arizona, 300,000 to Nevada. California actually is using, and has been using, Colorado River water in excess of 5.1 million acre-feet each year and our actual contracts with the Secretary of the Interior for Colorado River deliveries total 5,362,000 acre-feet per year.

The day after the Supreme Court decree, March 10, 1964, the two Arizona Senators introduced a bill to construct the central Arizona project and to create a new demand on the river of 1.2 million acre-feet per year of Colorado water. I offered an amendment to that legislation providing that in times

of scarcity the existing uses of Colorado River water in Arizona and in California to the extent of 4.4 million acre-feet would be given priority. Some people in California urged that my amendment terminate after 25 years. Their theory was that Congress would provide California with additional water within such a period of time. But that is a bad theory. Anyway, if Congress were to do so, no harm would result from my amendment. Contrarywise, if Congress failed to do so, only one State would suffer if the waters in the river diminished. Our water agencies objected to a 25-year guarantee. So did I. I suggested that it was like selling a man a life insurance policy which provided that the policy would lapse if the insured individual were to die.

The truth is that it is becoming increasingly difficult to enact giant water projects. And I must frankly say that there are people in Washington, in and out of Congress, who are somewhat averse to passing any legislation helpful to our State. They are blind to the fact that our State's population increases 600,000 a year. They pooch-pooch the fact that tens of thousands of our school children attend school only half days because of a lack of facilities.

At any rate, there is a growing danger of shortage in the river. Some day, and not too far in the future, the Pacific Southwest is going to require the importation of supplemental water from some surplus northern source in order to unshackle our otherwise inevitable future growth. And it is going to take the best exertions of all the States involved, and not just California, to enact the necessary Federal statutes. All the Colorado River States share this problem in varying degrees. And it will be far better, and the chances of legislative success will be far greater, if the States work together effectively rather than be ready to pounce at each other's throats.

Where there is a risk, common to two States or more, should not the risk be shared? If there is danger to two people, or to two States, why should one alone face it. Should they not stand together to repel it? That is the position of your southern California water agencies, a position which I wholeheartedly accepted from the beginning.

Several weeks ago in Washington, Secretary of the Interior Udall called a meeting attended by Governor Brown, of California; Governor Goddard, of Arizona; Senators HAYDEN and FANNIN, of Arizona; and myself. My California colleague, Senator MURPHY, was unavoidably absent but his views and mine are the same, and I spoke for both of us. We discussed the obvious need for additional water supply to both our States. I am glad to say it was agreed that, at long last, Arizona and California should join forces as good comrades and friends, and that we should together seek the means by which to avoid a shortage of water in the river in the years and generations ahead. We generally recognized that existing uses of Colorado River water in both Arizona and California ought to receive protection over new uses which would come into existence, when, for example, the \$1 billion central Arizona project would be built, as we know it must and should be built.

As a result of that meeting, legal representatives of those in attendance and of our water agencies met to draft a bill.

Here (I wish to pay tribute to a great water lawyer, Northcutt Ely, whose experience, whose skill, and whose indefatigable energy have been of enormous benefit to our cause. He has performed valiant service to our State. He was the leader in drafting the present bill, and his advice has been of immeasurable assistance to all of us who have labored to find a fair and equitable answer

to a long and bitter struggle. I must, too, give thanks to your own Bob Will whose fidelity to this cause has been constant, and whose help has been invaluable.

The guarantee to California of 4.4 million acre-feet of Colorado River water annually was written into the draft legislation. This proposed legislation recognizes the validity and the integrity of California's claim. It provides that if there is insufficient Colorado River water to supply 7.5 million acre-feet of consumptive use, divergence to the central Arizona project shall be reduced to the extent necessary to supply 4.4 million acre-feet of existing uses and decreased rights in California and to supply similar existing uses and rights in Arizona and Nevada as well. It further provides that this protection shall remain in force until the President proclaims that additional public works carry into the river, from an outside source, 2.5 million acre-feet of supplemental water.

Thus, this proposal gives to California a guarantee against new water demands which the central Arizona project will create. And when finally surplus waters in the north are transported thousands of miles into the Colorado River main stream, by a new repayable multibillion-dollar Federal undertaking, California's future requirements, far in excess of 4.4, will be met by the Colorado River and by the supplemental waters which will be poured into this selfsame stream.

On February 8, I introduced this legislation for myself and Senator MURPHY. It was subsequently introduced by all 3 Arizona Representatives and by 33 of California's 38 Representatives. The two Governors have publicly endorsed it. Senator HAYDEN has stated that he will support it, as has Senator FANNIN as well. They have not, however, placed their names on the bill as co-authors, though, as I say, their Governor has endorsed it, and their Arizona colleagues have all introduced the same bill.

A few days ago, Senator HAYDEN, Governor Goddard and I met with President Johnson. The President indicated an interest in approving my bill. He instructed his staff to confer with the Budget Bureau and the Secretary of the Interior to discuss the economics of the legislation, relative to the Bureau's report which must be made. I venture to hope that the executive branch will sanction this undertaking. If that is done, I think the Representatives in the Congress of all the Basin States may well give their approval. We will need all the help we can get.

The construction of the central Arizona project will be the first in a series of authorizations which finally will bring new water into the mainstream of the lower basin. Scarcity would be avoided, and the apprehensions of the Upper Basin States would be allayed. Our obligation to Mexico would be fulfilled, and all the States along the river could far better plan for their future water needs.

I think the agreement of our two States is a happy and auspicious development. We can now work together for the good of both. All the imprecations and bitterness of bygone years may now be swept away. As good neighbors, Arizona and California can work for the development and progress of both our people, and a brighter light will shine upon our future. We may look forward with considerable assurance to an increasing, rather than a dwindling, water supply. The magnet which has drawn, and is drawing, millions of people to this corner of the continent, does not seem to be losing its power. If we can solve the problem of an adequate water supply, then the 40 million Californians, who will call this State their home in the year 2000, will fulfill the hopes and dreams we proudly and fondly have for the future of our State.

NEGOTIATIONS TO BRING ABOUT A PEACEFUL, JUST, AND HONORABLE SETTLEMENT IN VIETNAM

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, few Senators, and few people of the United States have as full an understanding of foreign affairs and how to get along with the people of other countries as has the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. Therefore, I believe it is particularly appropriate at this time to have printed in the RECORD an editorial which was published in the Gleaner-Journal, of Henderson, Ky., on Friday, April 9, 1965. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR COOPER'S TIMELY ADDRESS

On March 25, Kentucky's JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, in a speech before the Senate, asked President Johnson to make it clear that our Government was willing to enter into negotiations to bring about a peaceful, just, and honorable settlement in Vietnam.

On April 7, a little more than 2 weeks later, President Johnson has followed up on Senator COOPER's request. The President said in a televised speech Wednesday night that the United States is ready to begin, without prior conditions, diplomatic discussions to end the war in Vietnam.

Though the President said that our Government has been willing to conduct such negotiations before, he has never said this publicly.

Previously, as Senator COOPER pointed out, the United States has imposed certain conditions before any negotiations could be started. The Communist Chinese and the North Vietnamese said that the United States would have to pull out of Vietnam before negotiations could begin. Quite naturally, our Government cannot agree to any such notion. But the United States imposed its own condition, namely, that the intervention and aggression of North Vietnam must cease before negotiations start.

Senator COOPER noted that in this atmosphere, both sides were seeking "a kind of unconditional surrender. I believe it more reasonable to say that we are prepared to enter into true negotiations."

Recalling events leading up to the ceasefire in Korea, COOPER noted that neither side in that conflict imposed previous conditions prior to the negotiations.

"Through negotiations, the effort was made to attain the objectives that we still seek today," said COOPER.

Every American ought to realize that the United States "can never accept the conditions now imposed by the Communists * * * and it is reasonable to say that they will not accept ours. There is no evidence that the Communists are willing to negotiate at all or that they will agree to any settlement which would end their support of the so-called war of national liberation which they have initiated," said COOPER.

But a formal announcement by the President that the United States is willing to negotiate without prior conditions would clear the air. President Johnson has now made such an announcement.

The Gleaner-Journal commends Senator COOPER for his very timely speech in the Senate. There is no doubt that the speech had a beneficial effect on U.S. policy.

Kentuckians can be grateful that Senator COOPER is on the alert in following foreign relations policy. His remarks triggered wide comment. The fact that our Government has altered its course is indicative of the importance of COOPER's speech.

April 22, 1965

7979

which includes the remarks of Dr. James A. Sensenbaugh, Maryland's distinguished superintendent of schools, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN A COUNTRY SCHOOL

It was wholly in keeping with his rural upbringing for President Johnson to go back to the one-room country schoolhouse in Texas, where he began the long climb toward learning, to sign the bill authorizing the vast new program of Federal aid to education. The one-room schoolhouse has long since passed from the lives of most of the Americans living today, but for men and women of the President's generation who were raised on farms the small rural school will always stand as a symbol of many fundamental aspects of education, such as the skill and devotion of teachers, the long-lasting effect that capable instructors exert on their pupils, and the fact that books and teachers are more valuable than big, new buildings.

The new bill and the boys and girls it is intended to help have little more than history in common with the one-room country schoolhouse. But history is important, and the contrast between Mr. Johnson's old school and the complex of modern problems—centering in the cities—toward which the Federal bill is directed helps to underline the fact that this is a major program which now challenges the ingenuity of State and city educators as much, if not more, than a roomful of lively boys and girls, ranging from the first to the eighth grades, challenged the country schoolteacher.

The bill is not intended to relieve States or communities of their present burdens, but to help them to do more and better work in areas which need attention. Its emphasis is on low-income families which may be aided, by new measures ranging from preschool education to efforts to reduce early teenage dropouts, to lift themselves and their children from the poverty level. There is a difference of opinion, of course, about the bill's special provisions under which parochial school pupils may benefit—and this may not be settled until the issue has been tested in court—but for the time being the significance of the bill is that it will make Federal funds available where outside help seems to be needed.

Dr. James A. Sensenbaugh, Maryland's superintendent of schools, deserves special mention for his comment yesterday. He said that educators have always said in the past that they couldn't do what they wanted to do with the money they were given. Now, he said, "we have an obligation to use our best thinking to come up with new ideas." That kind of an approach, and emphasis on the point that initiative should come from the community rather than from the Federal Government, will help to justify the bill and quiet the fears of citizens who feel that today, as in the time of the one-room schoolhouse, education should begin as close to home as possible.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have the recently adopted statement of the Council of Orthodox Synagogues of Greater Washington in support of S. 370 printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the Statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY COUNCIL OF ORTHODOX SYNAGOGUES OF GREATER WASHINGTON ON S. 370, THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

The Council of Orthodox Synagogues of Greater Washington, which represents nine synagogues in the Washington area, and,

through them, the entire Orthodox Jewish Community of Greater Washington, unqualifiedly supports S. 370, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. We share with all Americans of every race and creed the vital interest all have in improving the quality of public and private education and making knowledge fully available to the future generations of this country's citizens. There can, indeed, be no more certain insurance for the continued prosperity and well-being of the United States than a firm commitment of this Nation's resources toward the goal of superior educational opportunity for all. We view the proposed legislation as a sound and necessary step in that direction.

Our religious heritage also gives us a particular interest in this legislation. The Jewish people have come to be known as the "People of the Book," and our traditions have taught us reverence for learning and for scholarship, of both secular and religious. As Orthodox Jews we are concerned not only with training our children in the sciences and humanities, but in transmitting to them an understanding of and appreciation for the Jewish traditions which have kept our faith alive for almost the full recorded history of man. Experience has demonstrated that the most effective means of achieving this dual result is through the Jewish Day Schools, which supply children of the Jewish faith with a comprehensive secular education side-by-side with a Jewish religious program of study. There are now 272 such schools throughout the United States—two of which are in Washington, D.C.—and they operate autonomously as privately sponsored institutions supported by tuition-paying parents and voluntary contributors. These schools maintain exceedingly high standards in both their curriculums, and their graduates have distinguished themselves in various professions and community positions as well as in Jewish religious life.

The proposed legislation would alleviate the financial burden now borne by the parents of the children attending these schools, most of whom are of moderate means. It would do so by providing library and other books to be used in the secular curriculum of those schools, and by allowing the day schools, together with other public and private schools, to use the facilities of supplementary educational centers which could make available laboratories and other facilities, supplies, or services which strain the modest budgets of these institutions. Since the day schools provide a secular education which is equal to that given students in public or nonsectarian private schools, it is only fair to allot equal Federal assistance for these community services. Any exclusion for schools of this character from a program of Federal assistance for secular education merely because these schools offer, in the same building and as a part of the same day's course of study, classes aimed at fostering appreciation for and observance of Jewish traditions, would penalize children because of their faith. We believe that the first amendment's guarantee for the free exercise of religion as surely forbids such discrimination as does its prohibition against the establishment of religion proscribe direct support for any single religious cause.

The present legislation, S. 370, insures equal treatment for all institutions which mold our country's destiny by educating future generations in the sciences, humanities, and in the principles of loyal American citizenship. Since Federal assistance is necessary and since the legislation's standard is, in our view, one of the few permissible ones by which such assistance can be distributed, we unqualifiedly support S. 370 and urge its adoption.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF HATCH ACT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, some time ago, I introduced S. 1474

which would establish a bipartisan Commission of 12 members, including 2 from the Senate and 2 from the House, to suggest ways in which the Hatch Act might be amended to enable Government employees to participate more fully in civic and political affairs locally.

I am happy to report that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Rules Committee, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], has agreed to hold early hearings on this measure.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Washington Evening Star on April 14, 1965, supporting the measure which would establish such a Commission.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACK TO THE HATCH ACT

In refusing to authorize Government workers to participate in purely local politics on a partisan basis, the Civil Service Commission did not specifically contest the good sense of that proposal. But it passed the buck, with the comment that such a change should "more appropriately be considered by Congress."

This is a disappointment. For surely the spirit of the Hatch Act, and of the safeguards which that statute provides for the Federal career service, would not be abused by a Government employee who takes an active part in the local political affairs of his community. The fact is, of course, that some Government workers already do so. But they are forced, as the rules now stand, to circumvent the normal political structure and to participate only under the label of nonpartisan organizations. In an area such as Washington's, where so many citizens are affiliated with the Government, the effect is to sharply diminish the base of effective local leadership.

The Civil Service Commission position is, as we understand it, that this issue ought to be considered as part of a review of the Hatch Act as a whole. And such a review, along the lines proposed in a bill by Senator Brewster of Maryland, is no doubt in order after all these years.

But the trouble is that an extensive review and overhaul of the act is also an exceedingly complex proposition, on which Congress is not apt to complete any legislative action soon. Local political leaders, who are seeking a simple change in the civil service regulations to deal with the problem of local political participation, have now asked Commission Chairman John Macy for a hearing in order to further discuss the proposal. We think that request, at least, should be granted.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF MASSACRE OF ARMENIANS BY TURKS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the 50th anniversary of the Turkish genocide of the Armenians brings to mind not only the great self-sacrifice of this virile though ancient nation in the interest of virtuous government and human rights, but the important contributions made by the Armenians to the Allied war effort of 1915-18 as "The Little Ally" of the West.

The Armenians, although the smallest of the Allied nations to participate in the struggle against Germany and Turkey in World War I, contributed more to the Allied cause in terms of casualties than any other single allied state, large or small.

It is not generally known that when the Russian armies withdrew from the Caucasian front in 1917, the Armenians, scarcely 2 years after the terrible blood bath of 1915 which had been designed to destroy their nation, fielded an army and, in a series of brilliant campaigns, prevented the Turks from winning the oil reserves at Baku for use of the German war machine. These victories forced Turkey to recognize the newly formed independent Armenian state.

Such great sacrifices and devotion to the cause of freedom must not be forgotten in this year 1965, one-half century removed from the tragic events of 1915.

MEDICARE FOR THE AGED: SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE FOR DOCTORS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is heartening to know that the Senate Committee on Finance is working intensively to draft a report to the Senate on the administration bill, as amended, providing medical, hospital, and nursing home care for the elderly under social security coverage, commonly referred to as medicare.

Of course, the political doctors who control the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association oppose this bill, as they have always opposed every movement to better the health of the American people.

Furthermore, under the auspices of the political doctors heading the American Medical Association, referendums have been taken in various States of the Union—including my State of Ohio—and in every instance the physicians and surgeons in those States responded to the referendums by invariably voting by a percentage of 67 percent or more in favor of including doctors under social security coverage.

However, despite that, the American Medical Association's ruling clique continues to oppose social security coverage for physicians and surgeons. At the present time the medical profession is the only profession not included under the beneficent provisions of our social security laws. Of course, our social security system should be universal. It should apply to all, employed and self-employed alike.

Recently, Dr. W. E. Lockhart, writing in the Texas Journal of Medicine, stated:

In the decades that will come, historians, doctors and statesmen may marvel that the medical profession almost always took the conservative stand against progressive measures. * * * 20 years ago we opposed Blue Cross, fearing that this would lead to socialized medicine. * * * We doctors opposed Federal aid to medical education although we knew that medical schools had inadequate financing. * * * We are now opposing medical care for the aged under social security—actually a conservative measure that will become law and will be accepted by the American people. Why cannot medical leadership pick a winner in one race?

Mr. President, that was the statement of an eminent doctor from Texas. Many physicians and surgeons oppose the reactionary policies of that small group of political doctors who control the AMA.

May I conclude by repeating a short statement recently made to me by an Ohio physician, a personal friend of mine:

Most hospitals have the recovery room in the wrong place. It should be next to the cashier's office.

JOHN L. SWEENEY, FEDERAL CO-CHAIRMAN OF APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Appalachian Regional Commission held its first meeting this week and began the work of this important program. Since an important aspect of the program will be its administration, I believe it is essential that we know the man who will be in charge of carrying out the day-to-day tasks. He is Mr. John L. Sweeney who is the Federal Cochairman of the Commission.

An interview with Mr. Sweeney was reported in the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette on April 19, 1965. It portrays him as an industrious, resourceful, hard-working public servant.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the article in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SWEENEY: AMERICA'S ENVOY TO APPALACHIA
(By Harry Ernst)

WASHINGTON.—In the life of John L. Sweeney, theory and practice have frequently clashed and theory almost always has lost.

Sweeney, a 37-year-old combat veteran of American politics, recently was appointed by President Johnson, confirmed by the Senate and sworn in as Federal Cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission at an annual salary of \$27,000.

With a \$1.1 billion carrot and veto power over its spending as an imposing stick, Sweeney is the man who has to keep aid to Appalachia from becoming just another pork barrel.

His job will be essentially the same as that of a diplomat. As U.S. Ambassador to 11 States, he has to forge a regional development program that transcends State boundaries while keeping the natives and his Federal partners happy.

They include 11 Governors, ranging in politics from the racism of Alabama to the relative liberalism of West Virginia; their sometimes independent department heads; and a dozen Federal agencies that will be involved in the program.

If success emerges from such a melting pot of bureaucracy, Sweeney will be hailed as the first architect of President Johnson's creative federalism. If he fails, the State Department can always find a new country in Africa where it can dispatch a used diplomat.

A Chicago native, Sweeney clashed with theory when he enrolled at Michigan State University and discovered the serene academic life costs money. So he developed his character by driving a taxicab and bartending while working his way through school.

The State Department couldn't have come up with a better description of a skilled diplomat—the type of personality needed to keep aid to Appalachia from degenerating into an 11-State free-for-all.

Practical politics lured him away from the classroom and shattered some of his favorite theories.

Sweeney served as legislative secretary to

former Gov. C. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, for 4½ years, then became legislative assistant to Senator PAT McNAMARA, Democrat, of Michigan, and later staff director of the Senator's labor subcommittee.

After moving to Washington, Sweeney was so used to working and going to school that he couldn't resist obtaining a law degree from George Washington University by attending night classes.

"I have changed every one of my ideas about politics since coming to Washington," he observed. "I have learned the necessity for compromise in transferring the objectives of politics into public policy."

He thinks his best teacher has been President Johnson and his practice of consensus. And he has grown fond of Congress as "an immensely effective and responsible organization," although in his student days he considered it a historical hangover.

"The Appalachian development program," Sweeney thinks, "is a perfect example of how a useful program can result from an enormous amount of compromising."

In 1963, he was appointed Executive Director of the President's Appalachian Regional Commission and the following year became Chairman of its successor, the Federal Development Planning Committee for Appalachia.

President Johnson undoubtedly chose Sweeney, a cool midwesterner who never could be mistaken for a hillbilly, to serve as Federal commander of Appalachian development because of his knowledge of the delicate compromises that shaped the program.

Sweeney thinks two key decisions kept the program from fading away even before it reached Congress.

One was winning the support of conservative governors by limiting the program to financing public facilities and by giving them veto power over projects in their States.

The other was uniting the dozen Federal agencies behind the program by giving them the funds and responsibility for implementing the parts of it that are their traditional concern. They undoubtedly would have fought any effort to create a TVA-style Appalachian authority that would have displaced them.

Will Sweeney be as successful in implementing the Appalachian development program as he was in helping to establish it?

"He has one of the best minds I've seen," a coworker commented. "He has a terrific ability to express himself clearly and knows the best ways to persuade people to agree with him."

PROMPT ACTION ON IMMIGRATION REFORM LEGISLATION NEEDED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee has pending before it important immigration reform legislation in the form of S. 500, introduced on behalf of a number of Senators by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]. Another measure pending before the subcommittee is S. 1093, an immigration reform bill, which I introduced on February 10 together with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Some of the ways in which this measure differs from S. 500 are: First, provisions to accelerate the 5-year phase-out of the national origins quota in line with the prompt elimination by the bill of similar discrimination in the Asian-Pacific triangle; second, establishing of authority for judicial review of claims

April 22, 1965

7981

to U.S. nationality under the Administrative Procedure Act or Declaratory Judgment Act; third, the establishment of the 10-year statute of limitations for deportation cases; and, fourth, the creation of a Board of Visa Appeals in the Department of State to review, upon the request of the Secretary of State, any consular officer concerned, or of any person aggrieved all decisions denying or revoking visas or extensions thereof or the application of any State Department immigration regulations.

The latter two proposals were endorsed by the Association of the Bar of the State of New York in 1961 during its consideration of S. 551, immigration reform legislation which I introduced in the 87th Congress.

On April 1 of this year, the report of the Committee on Federal Legislation of the New York State Bar Association was published. The report urges the prompt enactment of S. 500 and favors the inclusion in S. 500 or enactment of separate legislation containing the provision of S. 1093 establishing a 10-year statute of limitations for deportation cases. On March 29, the New York County Lawyers' Association's Committee on American Citizenship issued its report also favoring enactment of S. 500.

I hope that the subcommittee will give both S. 500—which I have cosponsored—and S. 1093 its serious consideration, along with other measures, pending before it, and that prompt and favorable action will be taken by the Senate to enact badly needed immigration reform legislation during this session of Congress. It is time for the patchwork and piecemeal approach to immigration reform to be overhauled and a comprehensive new law codified.

It has been a decade since our immigration wall was perpetuated by the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, better known as the McCarran-Walter Act. Time and experience have more than dramatized the fact that, as its opponents contended 11 years ago, it is perhaps as unique a law as we have on our statute books. But these 11 years have also produced an atmosphere of political helplessness to exasperate even the most determined immigration reformers, so that today most are resigned to the now annual practice of settling for piecemeal revisions or temporary relief, rather than an effective overhaul of our entire policy of immigration. The backdoor methods Congress has used to cover up deficiencies in the basic law is the greatest proof of the law's inadequacies. Since the McCarran-Walter Act was enacted, Congress has passed special, short-term immigration and refugee legislation which has had the cumulative effect of admitting into the United States more than twice as many persons as permitted under the basic McCarran-Walter Act.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report by the Committee on Federal Legislation of the New York State Bar Association.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION—A REPORT BY THE COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL LEGISLATION (The President's proposals (S. 500, H.R. 2850) to amend the immigration laws to abolish the national origins system and to effect other reforms)

On January 13, 1965, President Johnson proposed to Congress that the national origins quota system for admission of immigrants be eliminated over a 5-year transition period and replaced by a system based upon the merits of each individual applicant as measured by, e.g. his skills, his relationships to persons living here, or his flight from political oppression.¹ These recommendations are contained in S. 500, introduced by Senator HART and 32 other Senators including JAVITS and KENNEDY of New York and in H.R. 2850, introduced by Congressman CELLER.²

More specifically, the principal proposals of S. 500 are:

1. "Phase-out" of the national origins quota system over a 5-year period by reducing such quotas 20 percent each year and transferring the numbers so released to a quota reserve pool. Thus in the first year, 20 percent (roughly 32,000) would be released to the pool; in the second year 40 percent (or 64,000) would be in the pool; until in the fifth year and thereafter, all quota numbers would be allocated through the pool. During the transition period the pool would be made up of the above released numbers and unused numbers of the previous year assigned to the old quota areas.

2. Immediate relief to minimum quota areas by increasing the minimum quota, now 100, to 200, subject to future reduction in the same manner as in (1) above.

3. Issuance of quota numbers based on the following preferences, (a) the first 50 percent, to persons with exceptional skills who will be "especially advantageous" to the United States, (b) next 30 percent (plus any part of the first 50 percent not used), to unmarried sons and daughters of U.S. citizens not eligible for nonquota status because they are over 21 years of age, (c) next 20 percent (plus any part of the first 80 percent not used), to spouses and unmarried sons and daughters of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States, and any portion remaining to other quota applicants, with percentage preferences to other relatives of U.S. citizens and parents of resident aliens, and then to certain classes of workers where there is a shortage of employable persons in the United States.

4. To prevent a single country from obtaining disproportionate benefits, issuance of more than 10 percent of the total quota numbers authorized for any year to any quota area would not be permitted.

¹ H. Doc. No. 52, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (1965).

² Other bills with the same objectives and substantially similar provisions have been introduced; viz., S. 436 (SCOTT), H.R. 503 (MATSUNAGA), H.R. 541 (THOMPSON, N.J.), H.R. 764 (GALLAGHER), H.R. 768 (GILBERT), H.R. 832 (MINISH), H.R. 1764 (DONOHUE), and H.R. 2587 (BURTON). H.R. 5324 (REID, N.Y.), having substantially the same objectives as the administration bill, would accomplish them by basing annual quotas on the latest U.S. census instead of the 1920 census as at present, and by redistributing unused quotas through regional pools; that is, Europe, Asia, Africa, and Australia. H.R. 1803 (WYDLER) would also abolish the national origins system but differs in other respects from the administration bill. H.R. 2078 (PHILBIN), provides for pooling of quotas under the present system.

5. To prevent inequities, the President, after consultation with the Immigration Board (established by sec. 18 of S. 500), may reserve for otherwise qualified immigrants whose admission would further the national security interest, up to 30 percent of the reserve quota pool and for refugees from oppression because of race, color, religion, national origin, adherence to democratic beliefs, or their opposition to totalitarianism or dictatorship, or who are uprooted because of natural calamity or military operations, up to 10 percent of the reserve pool. Any numbers so reserved and not needed revert to the pool.

6. Immediate elimination of the "Asia-Pacific Triangle" provision of existing law, discussed below.

7. Establishment of nonquota status for parents of U.S. citizens, as well as to a child (under 21) or spouse as present law provides.

8. Establishment of an Immigration Board composed of two Members from the House, two from the Senate and three members appointed by the President to study and consult Government departments on immigration policy, to make recommendations to the President as to reservation and allocation of quotas and to recommend to the Attorney General criteria for admission of skilled specialists and workers whose services are needed by reason of labor shortages in the United States.

In addition, S. 500 contains other provisions of more specialized application and makes technical changes in existing law which will not be discussed in this report.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee approves the objectives and provisions of S. 500 and urges its enactment.

In addition, we recommend that consideration be given to enacting, by inclusion in S. 500 or by separate bill, a 10-year statute of limitations for deportation cases, as was proposed in 1961 in S. 551 of the 87th Congress, which was a bill to amend the immigration laws by modifying but not abolishing the national origins system, introduced by Senator JAVITS for himself and Senators Keating, MORSE, CASE, and SCOTT.

DISCRIMINATORY PROVISIONS OF EXISTING LAW

(1) The national origins system

The national origins system had its genesis in the Immigration Act of 1924 (referred to as the 1924 act) and was carried forward in the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (referred to as the 1952 act). The number of persons allowed to enter the United States from any quota area (i.e., a particular country as designated under the act) during any year is limited (subject to exceptions respecting Asiatic persons hereinafter mentioned) to one-sixth of 1 percent of the number of inhabitants in the continental United States in 1920 attributable by national origin to such country. Each country, however, has a minimum quota of 100.³ Determination of quotas is the joint responsibility of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Attorney General.⁴

As most recently determined,⁵ 33 countries have quotas of more than the 100 minimum ranging from Great Britain and Northern Ireland (65,361) and Germany (25,814) to Estonia (115). Italy has 5,666.

While the national origins systems per se discriminates respecting country of origin of the immigrant, the law contains a not easily apparent discrimination against Negroes on

³ 8 U.S.C.A. 1151(a).

⁴ Id. 1151(b), 1152.

⁵ Pres. Proc. See 8 U.S.C.A. 1151, pocket part.

the basis of race.⁶ This is accomplished by the provision of 8 U.S.C.A. 1151(a) which requires that "the number of inhabitants in the continental United States in 1920 * * * shall be the same number heretofore determined under the provisions of section 11 of the Immigration Act of 1924 * * *." Section 11(d) of the 1924 act provided that in computing quotas the term "inhabitant of the continental United States in 1920" did not include the descendants of slave immigrants. Thus the Negro population of the United States is excluded in determining quotas under present law.

Moreover, the method of computing the national origins of the 1920 population of the continental United States is designed to give only a rough approximation of where our ancestors came from.

As explained in the 1961 report of the committee on Federal legislation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York⁷ on legislation then proposed to amend the immigration laws:

"The method employed in making the national origins calculations pursuant to that act was explained in a joint memorandum of the Secretaries of State, Commerce, and Labor dated February 25, 1928. S. Doc. 65, 70th Cong., 1st sess. In essence, the method employed in making the calculations was as follows:

"The population of the United States in 1790 was classified by national origin simply upon the basis of their surnames. Then immigration and census records for the period 1820 to 1920 were used to furnish the numbers of persons coming from each foreign country during those years. (Records from 1790 to 1820 were unavailable.) Then 1920 census statistics were used to supply the numbers of persons in the population who were either immigrants or the children of immigrants, and the countries of their national origin.

"Other persons included in the 1920 census were allocated among countries of origin upon the basis of projections of the 1790 population and the immigration thereafter, which projections were based in part upon assumed rates of natural increase. S. Doc. 65, 70th Cong., 1st sess.

"In other words, if persons of one national origin multiplied faster than persons of another national origin, the calculations made under the 1924 act would not reflect it."

S. 500 would phase out the national origins system over a 5-year period and eventually eliminate it.⁸

(2) Asia-Pacific triangle

The Asia-Pacific triangle comprises all quota areas situated wholly within an area bounded by meridian 60° east and 165° west longitude and north of the parallel 25° south latitude. It embraces all Asiatic countries from India to Japan and all Pacific Islands north of Australia and New Zealand, including (in addition to India and Japan) for example, China, Burma, Indonesia, Korea, Laos, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam. The 1952 act established a separate quota of 100 for the triangle itself⁹ in addition to the

separate quotas for each country within the triangle.

Complex rules determine whether an immigrant is chargeable to a quota area within the triangle or to the triangle quota.¹⁰ The interesting point is that these rules are based not on national origin but on race and apply to a person born outside the triangle (as well as to one born within it) if he, by as much as one-half his ancestry, is attributable to a people indigenous to, or a colony or dependent area or quota area located within, the triangle. For example, an immigrant born in Germany of a Malayan father and a German mother is chargeable to the Asia-Pacific triangle quota and a native of Canada born of a Japanese mother and a Canadian father, who otherwise would be a nonquota immigrant,¹¹ since he is a native of an independent country in the Western Hemisphere, is chargeable to the quota for Japan.

Enactment of S. 500 would result in immediate elimination of the Asia-Pacific triangle.¹²

(3) Chinese persons

When the Chinese exclusion laws were repealed in 1943, a special racial quota of 105 was established for Chinese persons wherever born.¹³ In addition, there is a quota of 100 for non-Chinese persons born in China. This arrangement was carried over into the 1952 Act.¹⁴ The Act of December 17, 1943, defined a Chinese person as an alien who has as much as one-half Chinese blood.¹⁵ Thus an adult Canadian born in Canada of a Canadian father and a Chinese mother cannot enter the United States except under the special Chinese quota.

Enactment of S. 500 would forthwith terminate this discrimination.¹⁶

NEED FOR REFORM OF IMMIGRATION LAWS

The Committee believes that amendment of the Immigration and Nationality Act in the respects proposed in S. 500 is long overdue. President Johnson favors, and his three predecessors, Presidents Kennedy, Eisenhower, and Truman favored, immigration law reform and the present bill has bipartisan support.¹⁷

Our immigration law today reflects a racial philosophy repugnant to our American tradition. It assumes that certain people are inferior to others solely because of where they were born. It discriminates against immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe. It is particularly offensive to Asiatic countries. It amounts, as Attorney General Nicholas de B. Katzenbach recently said, to selecting immigrants on the basis of "personal pedigree."¹⁸ It is an insult to the millions of U.S. citizens whose ancestors came from the very countries discriminated against by present archaic and anachronistic law.

As one writer has commented:¹⁹

"Through our immigration policies, we have managed to rub salt into the deepest wounds of two-thirds of the people of the world. Moreover, as we do not tire of pointing out to the Russians, deeds speak louder than words. It is difficult for the Voice of America to explain away what we are doing in these fields. At the moment, when we

are calling for a united free world opposed to communism, our immigration policies are based on invidious distinctions among countries and nationalities, including the very countries we wish to ally with us."

In 1776, our Declaration of Independence declared all men to be created equal in respect of certain inalienable rights. The Declaration was intended to be, and its consequences have been, worldwide in impact. Its promise of equal opportunity brooks no qualification based on what Chief Justice Stone has called " * * * obviously irrelevant and invidious * * * grounds."²⁰

The onward march of American history has been in significant part the story of ever-greater fulfillment of the promise of "liberty and justice for all" referred to in our Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag and reflected in the Declaration of Independence. The latest step was the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which outlawed discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin in public accommodations and in employment affecting commerce.²¹ That act constituted a solemn national declaration that henceforth such arbitrary discrimination was inconsistent with the deepest purposes of our Nation, thereby confirming the principles previously enunciated by the executive and judicial branches which are supported by increasing numbers of our people.²²

We believe that the selection of immigrants on the basis of their race and national origins is reminiscent of the notion that "some are more equal than others"²³ and should have no place in our national policy.

We have considered assertions that S. 500 would open the floodgates to uncontrolled immigration and we believe them to be groundless. Limitations in the bill would prevent any influx of undesirable immigrants. Indeed the emphasis placed in the bill on skilled persons should elevate the quality of those admitted. Safeguards protect against immigration becoming a contributing cause of unemployment in the United States. The provision (section 3) limiting to 10 percent of the total quota numbers authorized for any year the number of immigrants of a single quota area protects against any one country sending a disproportionate number of immigrants to the United States. Finally it is estimated that if S. 500 is enacted, authorized quota immigration would increase from the present 158,361 per year to about 166,000 and that the number of individual immigrants would increase by about 63,000.²⁴

Another reason for our support of S. 500 is that under judicial rulings to date remedial action for discriminations in existing law lies solely with our citizens and Congress. Often when a statute affects interests not represented in the legislature—which is the case with aliens—courts have been careful to protect the unrepresented from undue discrimination.²⁵ As to immigration policy,

²⁰ *Steele v. Louisville & Nashville R. Co.*, 323 U.S. 192, 203 (1944).

²¹ 78 Stat. 24, titles II and VII.

²² See "To Secure These Rights: Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights" (1947); *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954); *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356 (1886).

²³ George Orwell, "Animal Farm" (1946).

²⁴ *Op. cit.*, notes 1 and 17 *supra*. The apparent contradiction in the above figures is explained by the fact that some countries—for example, Britain and Erie—have large quotas under present law which are never filled. Under S. 500 unused quotas during the transition period would be allocated to the reserve pool and used.

²⁵ See *Southern Pacific Co. v. Arizona*, 325 U.S. 761, 767-768, n. 2 (1945); *McGoldrick v. Berwind-White Coal Mining Co.*, 309 U.S. 33, 45-46, n. 2 (1940); *Helvering v. Gerhardt*, 304 U.S. 405, 412, 416 (1938); *South Carolina State Highway Dept. v. Barnwell Bros.*, 303

⁶ In addition to discrimination against Chinese persons and races indigenous to the Asia-Pacific triangle, hereinafter discussed.

⁷ Reports of Committees of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York Concerned With Federal Legislation (1961).

⁸ S. 500, secs. 1 and 3. Bills to abolish the national origins system, similar to S. 500, have been proposed in earlier Congresses; for example, 84th Cong., 1st sess., S. 1206 by Senator Lehman. In 1961, the Committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York above referred to did not even consider two such pending bills (H.R. 6555 and H.R. 607, 87th Cong.) because the committee felt that they did not have enough support to stand a chance of enactment at that time.

⁹ 8 U.S.C.A. 1152(b) (1).

¹⁰ 8 U.S.C.A. 1152(b) (2) - (6).

¹¹ See 8 U.S.C.A. 1101(27).

¹² S. 500, sec. 6.

¹³ Act of Dec. 17, 1943, 57 Stat. 600.

¹⁴ 8 U.S.C.A. 1151(a).

¹⁵ Sec. 5(b).

¹⁶ S. 500, sec. 1.

¹⁷ Truman (H. Doc. No. 520, 82d Cong., 2d sess., p. 3 et seq. June 25, 1952); Eisenhower (H. Doc. No. 1, 85th Cong., 1st sess., p. 7; H. Doc. No. 329, 84th Cong., 2d sess.; H. Doc. No. 85, 85th Cong., 1st sess.); Kennedy (109 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD NO. 116, p. 12995, July 31, 1963).

¹⁸ New York Times, Feb. 11, 1965.

¹⁹ Kingsley, "Immigration and Our Foreign Policy Objectives," 21 Law and Contemp. Prob. 299, 306 (1956).

April 22, 1965

however, the courts have declined to exercise such review on the ground that the political branches have plenary power because immigration is " * * * vitally and intricately interwoven with * * * foreign relations."²⁹ Judicial rulings which have upheld the national origins system have been based on such plenary power of the political branches of Government.²⁷ Accordingly, such rulings cannot be taken as sustaining the reasonableness of existing immigration laws. There is here no "legitimation" of the enactment²⁸ as there might be in other areas.

THE PROPOSAL FOR A 10-YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS IN DEPORTATION PROCEEDINGS

S. 551, introduced in the 87th Congress by Senator JAVITS, proposed adding to the 1952 act a new section entitled, "Limitation of time of commencing deportation proceedings," as follows:

"Sec. 294. No alien shall be deported by reason of any conduct occurring more than 10 years prior to the institution of deportation proceedings."²⁹

Practically all civil remedies and criminal sanctions in our legal system are subject to time limitations precluding adverse consequences for conduct more than a certain number of years in the past. These are not to encourage unlawful conduct but because of the harmful social consequences of disrupting human affairs by reason of events in the far distant past.³⁰ The chief purposes of deportation are similar to two of the aims of the criminal law, i.e. to deter specified conduct and to prevent its repetition (in this country).

The result of the absence of any statute of limitations at present is shown by *Niukkanen v. McAlexander*, 362 U.S. 390 (1960), where a 52-year-old house painter who had been in the United States since his first birthday and had served honorably in our Army was ordered deported on parole evidence of conduct more than 20 years earlier.

We see no benefit to society resulting from deportations for long-past misconduct sufficient to justify such hardships in individual cases.³¹

CONCLUSION

The committee (1) urges the prompt enactment of S. 500 and H.R. 2580 and (2) favors enactment of legislation to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to add a 10-year statute of limitations for deportation cases.

Respectfully submitted,

Edwin L. Gasperini, Chairman; Francis A. Brick, Jr., Max Chopnick, Gerald E. Dwyer, William G. Fennell, Richard

U.S. 177, 184-185, n. 2 (1938); *Edwards v. California*, 314 U.S. 160, 174 (1941); *Nippert v. Richmond*, 327 U.S. 416, 434 (1946); Dowling, "The Methods of Mr. Justice Stone in Constitutional Cases," 41 Colum. L. Rev. 1160 (1941); Givens, "Chief Justice Stone and the Developing Functions of Judicial Review," 47 Va. L. Rev. 1321, 1343-1354 (1961).

²⁹ *Hartstades v. Shaughnessy*, 342 U.S. 580, 588-589 (1952).

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ See Charles L. Black, Jr., "The People and the Court" (1960).

²⁹ This proposal was endorsed by the Committee on Federal Legislation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York in 1961. Note 7 supra.

³⁰ See *Wood v. Carpenter*, 101 U.S. 135, 193 (1879); Holmes, "The Path of the Law," 10 Harv. L. Rev. 457, 477 (1897); Pound, "A Survey of Social Interests," 57 Harv. L. Rev. 1, 19 (1943); "Developments in the Law—Statutes of Limitations," 63 Harv. L. Rev. 1177, 1185-1186 (1950); compare H. Rept. No. 2096, 82d Cong., 2d sess. 192 (1952).

³¹ Maslow, "Recasting our Deportation Law: Proposals for Reform," 56 Colum. L. Rev. 309, 314-315 (1956).

A. Givens, Judd D. Grey, Constantine N. Katsoris, Lawrence Keepnews, Anthony P. Marshall, Thomas R. McHugh, Herbert Miller, Peter P. Mullen, George W. Myers, Jr., Edward L. Nadeau, Ellsworth Nichols, Alan K. Sawyer, Max Schwartz, Horace C. Winch.

REGIONAL RAILROAD PLANNING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the coordinated efforts of the States of New York and Connecticut in arriving at a solution for continued service of the New Haven Railroad is indeed good news. The approach of an agreement on State contributions of financial assistance is expected to permit service to continue in its present form for at least 18 months. This breathing period should be used to confront the problems of the New Haven and metropolitan mass transportation with new and greater vigor. The period of 18 months should permit sufficient time for the interested State governments and the Federal Government to formulate and act upon new, long-term solutions, to the control problems, which have received serious attention in the past months.

The New Haven commuter crisis has demonstrated more strongly than ever the need for a bistate public authority, which I have, together with Representative REID of New York, urged for some time to coordinate mass transportation problems in New York and Connecticut and the rest of the New England States. The bistate agency which I have proposed would consist of the States of New York and Connecticut and could be expanded to include the States of New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts. The bistate agency would have the authority to operate passenger rail and transit systems located within the participating States. It is conceivable that such an agency could also consider problems of regional planning for helicopter commuter service, interstate highway construction, and water travel.

We should not permit expectations of a temporary solution of the New Haven Railroad crisis to impair renewed efforts to deal immediately with long-term problems affecting the New Haven and problems of mass transportation in the Northeastern States generally. The renewed efforts of the Congress, the executive branch, and the State governments are very much needed to solve transportation problems affecting millions of citizens in these States.

On February 13, I introduced legislation to create a New York-Connecticut Rail Authority to provide machinery for such operation of passenger rail and transit systems in the New England States.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two editorials published in the New York Times of April 20 and April 22, 1965, supporting the principle and an editorial published in the New York Herald Tribune of April 21, recognizing the precedent of the assumption of governmental responsibility in the rail service problem area.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 20, 1965]

BASICS IN URBAN TRANSPORT

Analyzing the transportation problems that beset virtually every metropolitan area across the Nation, the Committee for Economic Development concludes that their root lies in the pattern of population growth. Over the last half century metropolitan areas have increased their share of the total population from under 40 percent to about 65 percent. The projection for the year 2000 is that 74 percent—or 235 million people—will then be living in 300 metropolitan areas.

At a time when major decisions about transportation are inescapable, governments in metropolitan areas are so fragmented that they have not developed agencies to take responsibility for viewing the area as a whole. As a result, decisions too often are left to State and Federal officials. This is certainly the case in the New York metropolitan area, spread as it is across three States, and containing 1,467 different political entities.

Now that New Jersey, after years of delay, has finally ratified the compact granting the Tri-State Transportation Committee legal status, the Legislatures of New York and Connecticut should follow suit without delay. The aim must be to have the committee functioning as the legal transportation-planning body for the metropolitan area by July 1, the date stipulated in the Federal Highway Act. The CED wisely emphasizes that the entire metropolitan area should be the basis for urban transportation planning. No one part of the area can go it alone.

The difficulties now being encountered in trying to work out some way to keep the bankrupt New Haven Railroad's commuter services running show the urgent need for a strong central body. New York and Connecticut are following divergent tracks; the Federal Government is reluctant to become involved, and there is danger that the rescue operation will be submerged in recriminations among the politicians. As we have repeatedly urged, the only sound solution is a public authority to operate all the commuter railroads in the area and coordinate them with the city subway system.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 22, 1965]

REPRIEVE FOR THE NEW HAVEN

The agreement that the New Haven Railroad will continue commuter operations into New York at their present level for at least 18 months from June 1 is a reprieve for 25,000 daily riders from Connecticut and Westchester County.

It is, however, only a temporary solution for the problem; not a permanent one. But it is an essential first step toward the ultimate goal.

Negotiations for a long-term agreement under which the New York Central Railroad would take over the management of the New Haven commuter operations for a fee are being carried on by New York and Connecticut. The essential problem here is how the inevitable operating deficit will be financed. While Federal officials have indicated a willingness to approve the \$3 million demonstration grant for the initial period, the White House opposes a continuation of subsidies. Will New York and Connecticut then foot the bill?

Analysis of the commuter railroad problem as a whole leads to the inescapable conclusion that any piecemeal settlement cannot be lasting. New York State is now negotiating to take over and operate the biggest commuter line of all, the Long Island Rail Road. New Jersey is trying desperately to shore up the Erie-Lackawanna, with its 35,000 commuters.

The transportation problems of the metropolitan community can only be resolved properly when the area is viewed as an entity. That is why we continue to urge the necessity for a tristate public authority to integrate the commuter railroads with the city

April 22, 1965

subway system and to operate them as a public utility.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 21, 1965]

THE NEW HAVEN COMMUTERS RESCUED

New York, Connecticut and the New Haven Railroad trustees have hit off an agreement which insures the preservation of commuter service for the next 12 to 18 months. Furthermore, all parties are confident that "a permanent solution" will be achieved during this breathing spell.

What's agreed upon for now is a "demonstration grant" program, which means that the two States chip in with money and tax relief, all of it rounded out with Federal help.

The point of first importance, of course, is that the trains won't stop running. Negotiation and good will triumphed. And for the long pull it has been established that rail mass transportation is absolutely essential, and that government accepts the responsibility of contracting and paying for this indispensable service. That's an important precedent; it makes history.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I also invite attention to the fact that there are a number of bills pending before the Committee on Commerce which could be helpful in giving a firm direction to Government policy on this issue.

TOWARD A STRONG WORLD MONETARY SYSTEM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a recent letter to the editor of the New York Times by my distinguished colleague on the Joint Economic Committee, Representative TOM CURTIS, of Missouri, emphasizes the need for new ways of providing adequate liquidity to finance world trade and payments. Representative CURTIS points out that, while liquidity has been barely sufficient, the recent drying up of U.S. capital outflows has created shortages of capital severe enough to present the danger of a liquidity crisis, and to impel Europeans as well as Americans to make innovations in present international monetary arrangements to avoid this possibility.

I, and my fellow Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee, have introduced concurrent resolutions in both the Senate and House urging the Executive to convoke a well-planned international conference to find solutions to the weaknesses of the world monetary system. Such a conference would consider the correct role for the IMF or other appropriate international organizations in the management of international credit, would consider how to supply credit to deficit countries in time to correct threatening imbalances, and how to increase the availability of long-term, low-cost credit to developing nations.

I ask unanimous consent that Representative CURTIS' letter may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOWARD A STRONG WORLD MONETARY SYSTEM To the Editor:

Evidence is accumulating that the administration's voluntary controls on U.S. foreign loans and investments have tightened European capital supplies. A Times corre-

spondent in Europe recently pointed out that the program "is working in the direction intended. It is greatly reducing and perhaps temporarily drying up, the flow of dollars to Europe."

Further evidence is the quieting of European bankers' demands that the United States raise its interest rates to curb the dollar outflow. These sentiments had been informally expressed as recently as March at the American Bankers Association international monetary conference.

The broad significance of the tightening of credit in European capital markets is its meaning for the international monetary system. Europeans have begun to experience the effects of our balance-of-payments deficits, as these deficits cease to supply the new liquidity that steady growth in world trade and payments demands.

Therefore, while the administration's controls over capital are clearly harmful to long-run U.S. interests, they may serve the short-run purpose of dramatically demonstrating the need for reform of the world monetary system, perhaps helping to break the inertia that has too long characterized the attitude both of key European governments and of our own.

FOR DECISIVE ACTION

The Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee unanimously stated in their recent views on the 1965 Economic Report of the President and the Council of Economic Advisers that "reform of the existing international monetary system is urgently needed." We felt that "because liquidity for the existing system is largely supplied by U.S. balance-of-payments deficits, the system could break down when the United States finally eliminates its chronic deficit * * *." The time for decisive action is now at hand. It should not await the final solution to our balance-of-payments problem.

Leadership of the kind required is not to be gained by mere tinkering with the present system, however valuable it has proved itself in the past. The resolution to increase the International Monetary Fund quotas approved in March by the IMF executive directors makes modest innovations in the ways gold will be used to back new quotas. One wonders with the London Economist whether this will be the last increase in fund resources made under the present largely anachronistic accounting mechanism, which works reasonably enough when the dollar and sterling happen to be strong but in present circumstances makes the Fund heavily dependent on bilateral credits agreed through the Paris Club.

Many international economists will argue that international liquidity is now great enough to continue for several years to serve the requirements of world trade. Others, such as Dr. Walter Salant, of the Brookings Institution, feel that recent developments are already bringing the liquidity problem to a head.

TO CONVOKE CONFERENCE

Concurrent resolutions introduced in both the Senate and House, and sponsored by Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee, request the Executive to convoke a well-planned international conference to find solutions to the weaknesses of the world monetary system.

Such a conference would consider the correct role for the IMF or other appropriate international organizations in the management of international credit, would consider how to supply credit to deficit countries in time to correct threatening imbalances and how to increase the availability of long-term, low-cost credit to developing nations.

U.S. leadership in creating a suitable world monetary system is long overdue. The President must provide that leadership now. Prime Minister Harold Wilson's visit to the

United States provides a unique opportunity to demonstrate that leadership.

THOMAS B. CURTIS,
Member of Congress,
Second District, Missouri.

WASHINGTON, D.C., April 12, 1965.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution of the town of Henrietta, N.Y., protesting the closing of a Veterans' Administration hospital at Bath, N.Y.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HENRIETTA, N.Y.,
April 14, 1965.

Senator JACOB JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the Town Board of the Town of Henrietta on April 7, 1965, the following resolution was passed:

"In consideration of the many veterans residing in Monroe County, State of New York, and taking into account the many medical needs required by these veterans because of war inflicted injuries and disabilities: Be it hereby

"Resolved, That the Town Board of Henrietta, N.Y., support the Monroe County Veterans' Organizations attempts to secure a veterans hospital for the county of Monroe; further

"Resolved, That this town board wishes to go on record as being opposed to the closing of the Veterans Hospital in Bath, N.Y."

Your thorough investigation and considered favorable action in this matter will be greatly appreciated and made known to all veterans and other interested persons of our area.

Very truly yours,

VINCENT HAGGETT,
Town Clerk,
Town of Henrietta.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be included, as a part of the debate on the pending bill, S. 1564, the report of the Committee on Federal Legislation and the Committee on the Bill of Rights of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, which in my opinion sustains the constitutionality of the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the report relates to news reports on actions of the committee up to April 9; hence it is somewhat dated, but in essential substance it will give Members of the Senate the information which they urgently need with respect to a consideration of the bill before us.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSED FEDERAL LEGISLATION ON VOTING RIGHTS

(By the Committee on Federal Legislation, the Committee on the Bill of Rights, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, N.Y.)

INTRODUCTION

On March 17, 1965, President Johnson sent to Congress a special message on voting rights and submitted with it a proposed bill

May 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9625

Mr. STAGGERS. I have to lump the gentleman from Iowa with the Congress, because he is a Member of Congress. Congress did it, and I speak of "we" as the Congress. Whether we are in opposition or not, it is always the majority that rules.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STAGGERS. Surely.

Mr. GROSS. If we could get the kind of a setup over there that would put a stop to such business as studies of human behavior at cocktail parties and a study of the intrapersonal relationship of a husband and wife and that kind of drivel, I might be persuaded to go along with you for one assistant secretary. I cannot go along with three. Does not the gentleman agree they are able now, with the staff that they have, in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to get rid of an enormous amount of money every year?

Mr. STAGGERS. In order to answer that question, you know that I would have to rephrase it.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman would have to agree, would he not?

Mr. STAGGERS. Of course, but I would have to explain why. It is because we are the ones that forced those duties on them and increased their responsibilities almost ninefold without giving them the tools to do it. Yet we expect them to do a good job. If we do that, we must give them the personnel and the men with responsibility in order to hold them responsible. Let me read you what the Secretary said in regard to this:

I have to keep staff working 12 to 14 hours a day, 6 to 7 days a week, day in and day out. I don't think that that is good management, particularly during the legislative sessions, which are long sessions.

That is one reason for it. As the chairman said a moment ago, we have set up a special committee in our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to study this Department.

Under the able leadership of the gentleman from Florida a thorough study will be made and if some of these things are not right—and since these matters are all handled by human beings and, like the gentleman and myself, they are not perfect—I am sure they will try to iron out any difficulties. I have been trying to explain why the Department needs these, and to my mind they do need them. That is why I am opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the committee as printed in the report of the bill.

The committee substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having assumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that

that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2984) to amend the Public Health Service Act provisions for construction of health research facilities by extending the expiration date thereof and providing increased support for the program, to authorize additional Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 355, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 333, nays 4, not voting 96, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

YEAS—333

Abbitt	Clausen	Flood
Abernethy	Don H.	Flynt
Adair	Cleveland	Foley
Adams	Clevenger	Ford, Gerald R.
Addabbo	Cobelan	Ford,
Albert	Collier	William D.
Anderson, Ill.	Colmer	Fountain
Anderson,	Conable	Frellinghuysen
Tenn.	Conte	Friedel
Andrews,	Cooley	Fulton, Pa.
Glenn	Corbett	Fulton, Tenn.
Andrews,	Corman	Fuqua
N. Dak.	Craley	Gallagher
Arends	Culver	Garmatz
Ashbrook	Cunningham	Gathings
Ashmore	Curtis	Gettys
Aspinall	Daddario	Gibbons
Baldwin	Dague	Gilbert
Bandstra	Davis, Ga.	Gonzalez
Baring	Dawson	Goodell
Bates	de la Garza	Gray
Beckworth	Delaney	Green, Pa.
Belcher	Denton	Greigg
Bell	Derwinski	Grider
Bennett	Devine	Griffin
Betts	Dickinson	Griffiths
Blatnik	Diggs	Grover
Boggs	Dingell	Gurney
Bolton	Dole	Hagan, Ga.
Bonner	Donohue	Hagen, Calif.
Bow	Dorn	Haley
Bray	Dow	Hall
Brock	Dowdy	Halleck
Broomfield	Downing	Hanley
Brown, Ohio	Dulski	Hansen, Idaho
Broyhill, Va.	Duncan, Oreg.	Hansen, Iowa
Burke	Duncan, Tenn.	Hardy
Burleson	Dyal	Harris
Burton, Calif.	Edmondson	Harsha
Burton, Utah	Erlenborn	Harvey, Ind.
Byrne, Pa.	Evans, Colo.	Harvey, Mich.
Byrnes, Wis.	Everett	Hathaway
Cabell	Evins, Tenn.	Hawkins
Callan	Fallon	Hays
Callaway	Farbstein	Hebert
Cameron	Farnsley	Hechler
Carter	Farnum	Helstoski
Cederberg	Fascell	Henderson
Chamberlain	Feighan	Herlong
Clancy	Findley	Hicks
Clark	Fisher	Hollifield

Horton	Mink	Scheuer
Hoemer	Mize	Schlesler
Howard	Moeller	Schmidhauser
Hull	Moore	Schneebell
Hungate	Moorhead	Schweiker
Huot	Morris	Scott
Hutchinson	Morrison	Secrest
Ichord	Morse	Selden
Irwin	Moss	Senner
Jacobe	Murphy, Ill.	Sickles
Jarman	Murphy, N.Y.	Sikes
Joelson	Murray	Slack
Johnson, Calif.	Natcher	Skubitz
Johnson, Okla.	Nedzi	Smith, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.	Nelsen	Smith, Iowa
Jonas	O'Brien	Smith, N.Y.
Jones, Ala.	O'Hara, Ill.	Smith, Va.
Jones, Mo.	O'Hara, Mich.	Springer
Karsten	O'Konski	Stafford
Karth	Olsen, Mont.	Staggers
Kastenmeier	Olsen, Minn.	Stalbaum
Kee	O'Neal, Ga.	Stanton
Keith	Ottenger	Steed
Kelly	Patten	Stratton
Keogh	Pelly	Stubblefield
King, Calif.	Pepper	Taylor
King, N.Y.	Perkins	Teague, Calif.
King, Utah	Philbin	Teague, Tex.
Kirwan	Pickle	Tenzer
Kluczynski	Pike	Thomas
Kornegay	Pirnie	Thompson, Tex.
Krebs	Poage	Thompson, Wis.
Kunkel	Poff	Trimble
Langen	Pool	Tuck
Latta	Price	Tunney
Leggett	Pucinski	Tupper
Lipscomb	Quie	Tuten
Long, La.	Race	Udall
Long, Md.	Randall	Ullman
Love	Redlin	Van Deerin
McClary	Reid, Ill.	Vigorito
McCulloch	Reinecke	Vivian
McDade	Reuss	Walker, N. Mex.
McEwen	Rhodes, Ariz.	Watts
McFall	Rhodes, Pa.	Wetner
McGrath	Rivers, Alaska	Whalley
McMillan	Rivers, S.C.	White, Tex.
McVicker	Roberts	Whitener
MacGregor	Rogers, Colo.	Whitten
Machen	Rogers, Fla.	Willis
Mackay	Rogers, Tex.	Wilson, Bob
Madden	Ronan	Wilson,
Mahon	Roncallo	Charles H.
Marsh	Rooney, N.Y.	Wolf
Martin, Ala.	Rooney, Pa.	Wyatt
Martin, Mass.	Rosenthal	Wydler
Martin, Nebr.	Rostenkowski	Yates
Matsunaga	Roudebush	Young
Matthews	Roush	Younger
May	Roybal	Zablocki
Meede	Rumsfeld	
Michel	Ryan	
Mills	Satterfield	

NAYS—4

Waggonner Walker, Miss.

NOT VOTING—96

Andrews,	Fino	Nix
George W.	Fogarty	O'Neill, Mass.
Annunzio	Fraser	Passman
Ashley	Giamo	Patman
Ayres	Gilligan	Powell
Barrett	Grabowski	Purcell
Battin	Green, Oreg.	Quillen
Berry	Gubser	Reid, N.Y.
Bingham	Halpern	Reifel
Boland	Hamilton	Resnick
Bolling	Hanna	Robison
Brademas	Hansen, Wash.	Rodino
Brooks	Holland	Roosevelt
Brown, Calif.	Jennings	St Germain
Broyhill, N.C.	Laird	St. Onge
Buchanan	Landrum	Saylor
Cahill	Lennon	Shipley
Carey	Lindsay	Shriver
Casey	McCarthy	Stephens
Celler	McDowell	Sullivan
Chelf	Macdonald	Sweeney
Clawson, Del.	Mackie	Talcott
Conyers	Malliarad	Thompson, La.
Cramer	Mathias	Thompson, N.J.
Curtin	Miller	Todd
Daniels	Minish	Vanik
Davis, Wis.	Minshall	Watkins
Dent	Monagan	White, Idaho
Dwyer	Morgan	Widnall
Edwards, Ala.	Morton	Williams
Edwards, Calif.	Mosher	Wright
Ellsworth	Multer	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

May 10, 1965

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Laird.
 Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Wild-
 nall.
 Mr. Multer with Mr. Minshall.
 Mr. Dent with Mr. Elsworth.
 Mr. Jennings with Mr. Ayres.
 Mr. Lennor with Mr. Broyhill of North
 Carolina.
 Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Saylor.
 Mr. Shipley with Mr. Mosher.
 Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Cahill.
 Mr. Toll with Mr. Lindsay.
 Mr. Glaimo with Mr. Maillard.
 Mr. Daniels with Mrs. Dwyer.
 Mr. Brooks with Mr. Cramer.
 Mr. Rodino with Mr. Halpern.
 Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Reid of New York.
 Mr. Wright with Mr. Shriver.
 Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Watkins.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Berry.
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Robison.
 Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Del Clawson.
 Mr. Carey with Mr. Fino.
 Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Quillen.
 Mr. Morgan with Mr. Gubser.
 Mr. Minish with Mr. Baffin.
 Mr. Monagan with Mr. Morton.
 Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Taicott.
 Mr. Casey with Mr. Whalley.
 Mr. Brademas with Mr. Reifel.
 Mr. Barrett with Mr. Mathias.
 Mr. Miller with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
 Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr.
 Davis of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Nix with Mr. Curtin.
 Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr.
 Buchanan.
 Mr. St. Germain with Mr. Holland.
 Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Ashley.
 Mr. Hanna with Mr. Powell.
 Mr. McDowell with Mr. Sweeney.
 Mr. Vanik with Mr. Williams.
 Mr. Chelf with Mr. Edwards of California.
 Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Brown of Cali-
 fornia.
 Mr. Todd with Mr. McCarthy.
 Mr. Bingham with Mr. Conyers.
 Mr. Boland with Mr. Mackie.
 Mr. Patman with Mr. Stephens.
 Mr. Passman with Mr. Gilligan.
 Mr. Fraser with Mr. Hamilton.
 Mr. Purcell with Mrs. Hansen of Washing-
 ton.

The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the
 table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask
 unanimous consent that all Members
 who may desire to do so may extend
 their remarks in the RECORD at an ap-
 propriate place, on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AL-
 BERT). Is there objection to the request
 of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, on
 rollcall No. 96 I was absent from the
 floor because of urgent business affecting
 my district. Had I been present I would
 have voted "aye."

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE: A COM- MEMORATION

(Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of
 Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to ex-
 tend his remarks at this point in the
 RECORD.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, to-
 day, May 10, 1965, we commemorate the
 anniversary of Rumanian independence.

Americans derive a special pleasure
 in paying tribute to other people in the
 world who have succeeded in asserting
 their own right of self-determination.
 This has always been the case, ever
 since we had won our own independence.
 During the 19th century Americans were
 the evangelists of self-determination and
 constitutional democracy. Official docu-
 ments of our Government, either in the
 form of congressional debates, of official
 State Department dispatches, or of pro-
 clamations and statements by the Presi-
 dent, all reflect this profound national
 tradition that is deeply ingrained in our
 national attitudes.

It is not strange, therefore, that we
 in this Chamber should set aside our
 legislative duties for a few moments and
 pay our respects to this great nation
 and great people, the Rumanians.

Today it is even more urgent for us
 to commemorate Rumanian independen-
 ce, because one of the central themes
 of Communist propaganda, a theme that
 they use unceasingly to attack the Unit-
 ed States and its allies, is the charge of
 imperialism. According to the Commu-
 nists, American democracy is the tyrann-
 y of the modern age. It is we who are
 held up to the world as the imperialist
 aggressors who seek to destroy the lib-
 erties of all people in the world.

By commemorating the independence
 of Rumania and all other countries who
 have been conquered by the Communists
 we are able to mount a counterattack
 against this fallacious charge.

It is communism and not democracy
 that is the plague of the modern age.

Communism is the enslaver of man-
 kind, and democracy the greatest politi-
 cal force for the liberty and well-being
 of man.

Rumanians had no free choice in the
 government that was to rule them.
 Communists came to Rumania in the
 wake of the conquering Red army. Free
 elections were never held. Communist
 political power was imposed by force and
 terror. Rumania stands as one of the
 classic examples of the destruction of
 human liberty by communism. It is now
 a bitter reminder to us of what can hap-
 pen in South Vietnam if American re-
 solve is weakened.

Communism has conquered Rumania,
 but the hope of all is in the historic po-
 ssibility that Rumanians may themselves
 conquer communism. This may not
 come in the form of any sudden revolu-
 tion that itself could endanger the peace
 of Europe. But there is a real possibility
 that through the erosion of communism,
 the reassertion of traditional national
 Rumanian values, and the continuing or-
 ientation of its political and economic in-
 terests toward the West, the Rumanian
 people may consume the tyrant and the
 tyranny that have oppressed them since
 1945. Great changes have taken place
 in Rumania and in Rumania's attitude
 toward the West in the past few years.
 This development may be but the begin-
 ning of a long evolving trend toward a
 Western alignment.

This is our hope; this is our expecta-
 tion.

Whether it will come to pass is a mat-
 ter of future history. But we do know
 that the assertion of Rumanian in-
 dependence, as we have observed in the
 past few years, however limited it is in
 range, nonetheless, detracts from the
 total power assets of the Soviet Union
 and thus is a development that coincides
 with American interests as well as those
 of the Rumanian people.

In the final analysis our great hope is
 for a free and independent Rumania.
 Perhaps in the unfolding of future his-
 tory we may be able to commemorate
 May 10 not only as the day of Rumanian
 independence from the Turks but also
 commemorate it as a day of independen-
 ce from communism.

IMMIGRATION HEARINGS

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given
 permission to address the House for 1
 minute; to revise and extend his remarks
 and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, hearings
 on pending immigration legislation,
 which were scheduled to resume on May
 12, are now postponed to a later date, to
 be announced as soon as circumstances
 permit.

The postponement results from the
 fact the full Judiciary Committee has not
 completed action on the voting rights
 bill and the likelihood that the balance
 of the week and possibly longer will be
 required to complete that action.

I include at this point a letter from
 Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, chair-
 man of the Judiciary Committee, to-
 gether with my answer thereto, both of
 which are self-explanatory.

MAY 7, 1965.

HON. EMANUEL CELLER,
 Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
 House of Representatives, Rayburn House
 Office Building.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: This will acknowledge
 receipt of your letter of today's date suggest-
 ing that I postpone the public hearings on
 proposed changes in the Immigration and
 Nationality Act, scheduled to resume on May
 12, until a final vote has been taken by the
 full committee on the pending voting rights
 bill.

I am making arrangements for a postpone-
 ment of immigration hearings and will an-
 nounce the postponement so that all inter-
 ested parties may be advised.

As you know, I have cooperated fully in
 meeting the schedule set for full committee
 hearings and vote on both the Presidential
 inability bill and the voting rights bill, by
 postponing prior hearings scheduled by Sub-
 committee I on pending immigration legis-
 lation. There is no question about the im-
 mediate importance of action on that legis-
 lation, but I am sure you are aware that
 there has been misunderstandings about the
 reasons for delay in completing our immi-
 gration hearings. As matters now stand,
 some 20-odd national organizations in addi-
 tion to interested individuals have made
 written requests to be heard on proposed
 changes in the immigration law.

It is my desire to conclude our immigra-
 tion hearings as soon as possible by contin-
 uous hearings and to that end I will plan to
 resume our hearings immediately after final
 action has been taken by the full committee
 on the voting rights bill.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
 Chairman.

May 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9627

MAY 7, 1965.

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee No. 1, Committee
on the Judiciary, House of Representa-
tives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: In view of the importance of the voting rights legislation now before us and which the committee has been considering in full committee for a number of days, may I suggest that you postpone your public hearing on the proposed changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act until final vote on the pending Voting Rights Act of 1965 has been taken by the full committee.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER, Chairman.

GOVERNMENTAL INTRUSION INTO A CITIZEN'S RIGHT TO PRIVACY

(Mr. HUNGATE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Vandalia Leader, Vandalia, Mo., under the authorship of Weldon H. Steiner. It relates to the invasion of the right of privacy through snooping and wiretapping.

I want to join with Mr. Steiner and Senator Long and my fellow Representative from Missouri [Mr. HALL] in their concern about this threat of governmental intrusion into a citizen's right of privacy.

The editorial referred to follows:

[From the Vandalia (Mo.) Leader,
Mar. 18, 1965]

EAVESDROPPING

Missouri's Senator Ed Long opened hearings last month on the controversial subject of Government eavesdropping. One of the days was devoted to the demonstrations of electronic devices that are available and currently in use for Federal agency snooping.

This display of devices was amazing and seemed to bring out the fact that nothing is private any more. Such things as olives in martini glasses, devices in packs of cigarettes, tiny concealed tape recorders. Reading the list of devices being used one came up with the conclusion that to maintain a tight lip at all times is the only assurance of security. This might not even be safe in the future. It wouldn't surprise the average U.S. citizen to learn of a device to determine what one is thinking.

Senator Long's committee hearings indicated that many of these devices are purchased by the nonsecurity Federal agencies. The committee stated that it is recognized that the interest of criminal justice and our country's safety from foreign enemies must be maintained by the Federal officials who have the responsibilities. But, at the same time, the right to privacy that Americans have always guarded and cherished must be preserved against the threat of increasingly clever techniques of electronic snooping.

We wouldn't agree more wholeheartedly.

CENTENNIAL OF THE FOUNDING OF ONE OF AMERICA'S OUTSTANDING PREPARATORY SCHOOLS

(Mr. MARSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, May 8, marked the centennial of the

founding of one of America's outstanding preparatory schools. I refer to Augusta Military Academy located at Fort Defiance in Augusta County near Staunton, Va. This school for young men, that seeks not only to provide formal preparatory education, but also seeks to build character and attain physical excellence, is well known throughout the Commonwealth of Virginia and America for its outstanding program of military instruction.

AMA, as it is known to the student body, area citizens, and graduates, has attained this reputation for excellence through the achievements of its alumni, its educational curriculums, the qualifications of its faculty, and the continuous leadership by its administration.

The history of Augusta Military Academy is part and parcel of the post-Civil War history of the South. It was founded in 1865 by a young veteran of the Confederate Army, Charles S. Roller, who, viewing the devastation of his native State and the Valley of Virginia that was his home, saw the need in the South for the establishment of educational facilities that had been destroyed by 4 hard, grinding years of war. The predecessor institution of Augusta Military Academy, a day school founded in 1742 by the Reverend John Craig, was burned to the ground by General Seigel of the northern army in this campaign through the valley.

It is a tribute to the leadership and ability of Charles S. Roller that Augusta Military Academy was able not only to survive but flourish and grow in the Reconstruction era.

The responsibility for the administration passed on the death of the founder to his two sons, Col. Thomas J. Roller and Maj. Charles S. Roller, Jr., who became better known as Major General Roller. The recent passing of Major General Roller was mourned not only at Augusta Military Academy, but throughout the State of Virginia; however, on his death, the school would remain a family school, inasmuch as the administration was vested in a family trusteeship including the widow of General Roller, Col. M. H. Livick, now principal, and Mrs. Livick, the form of management which continues today.

It is a privilege for me to pay tribute to the 100 years of public service by AMA, but the finest testimony to the contributions of Augusta Military Academy in the development of character and scholarship is to be found in the dedicated service of its alumni in leadership assignments in the Armed Forces of the United States during our Nation's wars as well as in countless fields of civilian endeavor.

THREAT OF NATIONWIDE BOYCOTT OF JAPANESE GOODS

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the Congress of American

Fishermen is organizing a nationwide boycott of Japanese goods. The date-line set for picketing of Japanese ships and U.S. merchants who carry Japanese goods for sale is June 1, or as soon as the Japanese fishing fleet begins netting American runs of Pacific red salmon on the high seas. This protest campaign is scheduled to break out, I am told, throughout the Nation, and signs such as "No Jap goods sold in this store" are already being printed, as well as bumper strips, and so forth, to incite public reaction against the unwillingness of the Japanese to cooperate with the United States in fishery conservation in the North Pacific Ocean.

Mr. Speaker, ever since World War II, I have sought the upbuilding of trade with Japan and have been gratified at the ever-growing exchange of goods between our two nations. I have nothing against Japan and want to see our trade grow, so it is with deep regret that I find, like a smoldering volcano, an eruption of ill will, economic harm, and bad feeling is in the making.

How serious this boycott could be, I doubt if anyone knows, but it appears that organized labor may well follow its tradition and support our fishermen and their various affiliated unions. This could tie up every Japanese vessel that comes into port and all Japanese imports that cross our docks.

The worst part of the boycott is that ill will and prejudice generated today cannot be shut off like an electric switch. The ill will and hurt will go on long after any settlement. Unfortunately, too, the wounds of Pearl Harbor will be opened anew and our two peoples will renew old hates.

So, as I say, I hope this boycott does not get started; but at the same time, if it does start, I intend to support our fishermen in every way possible. Ten years ago, Japan agreed by treaty to protect American red salmon on the high seas, and I, for one, will not stand quietly by and see the Japanese abdicate this position and destroy the runs of fish made possible by our fishermen through sacrifice for the sake of conservation.

The time is short, and I hope and pray that our Government can dissuade the Japanese from causing a trade war that will hurt both sides, and which both sides will regret.

"WORLD'S GREATEST COLLEGE WEEKEND"

(Mr. BRAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the "World's Greatest College Weekend" again has been celebrated on the Indiana University campus.

Springtime on Indiana campuses always is inspiring. The wholesome youth in our great Indiana colleges give hope in the future of our country.

Indiana University's "Little 500" is based on the great Hoosier 500-Mile Memorial Day Auto Races. It was commenced several years ago by Howdy Wil-

cox, who at that time was director of the Indiana University Foundation and who now is a member of the board of trustees of the university and general manager of the Arizona Republic and Phoenix Gazette. This colorful weekend not only includes tests of athletic prowess in the men's bicycle races and the coed's tricycle races, but adds color, pageantry, artistry, pulchritude, and the sheer effervescence of youth to an unforgettable weekend. The proceeds of the "Little 500" weekends have provided for almost 2,000 scholarships.

I am happy to say that the students on the campuses of the colleges of Indiana look quite different from the 17,000 "students" who demonstrated in Washington recently carrying signs attacking their country. I also am proud that as yet students on the campuses in Indiana have not emulated the students and faculty members in some eastern colleges, who sent a cablegram to Ho Chi Minh saying, in part, "You have our respect and sympathy." Nor have our students followed the lead of a group of students in a midwestern college who sent money to the "National Liberation Front" (the Vietcong). Neither have our students made a public demonstration of burning their draft cards in a bonfire, as occurred in a western university.

I still am proud of the youth of America despite the actions of some. We should not allow the actions of those few to cause us to lose faith in the future of America, which of course depends upon the youth of today.

In every generation there are some who are misfits. Some are guilty of treason. There are many more who are misguided, and in a frenzy of idealism lose perspective in viewing their own country.

Despite the extremism of a small fraction, the great majority of our youth are ready and willing to support their country and to defend freedom.

ARMED FORCES WEEK

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, at a multi-service dinner at the Sheraton Park Hotel in this city, last Friday evening, the Navy League, the Air Force Association, and the Association of the U.S. Army, "kicked off" our Armed Forces Week, which this Nation reverently and pensively celebrates in honor of those who dedicate their service, their lives, and their youth to the freedom of this Nation and other responsible nations who seek our help.

Gen. Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, led off the three major uniformed military services, as greetings were sent to the servicemen and women around the world.

Predicated upon enhanced communication and increased ease of transportation, the general very wisely sums up the situation of the real world, while remarking that, just as in the case of individuals, nations must be "responsible," if deterrence, conference, and eventual

peace are to hold sway. General Johnson sums it up for the past, present and future by referring to our faith under the fatherhood of God, and the rights of individual peoples to be free. Based on political, geographic, technical and an additional shrinking of the world, requirements have never been greater for dedicated, well-trained talent and for equipment and unit combat readiness around the world.

I commend these remarks by one of our greatest chiefs to the careful consideration of my colleagues:

REMARKS BY GEN. HAROLD K. JOHNSON, CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. ARMY, AT THE NATIONAL ARMED FORCES DAY DINNER, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 7, 1965

This Armed Forces Week finds our Nation and its Armed Forces team in a world that is shrinking: politically, geographically, and technologically. This world generates greater risks for our national security and greater demands on our Army, Navy, and Air Force.

In a political sense the world is shrinking because in many parts of the globe once dormant lands are emerging as restless new nations, anxious to come of age quickly, yet often inadequately equipped to protect themselves against covert or overt aggression. As the number of these nations swells, and so long as the Communist world pursues its avowed objective of communizing the world, there are likely to be more trouble spots where stability must be maintained or restored. Hence we may expect more, rather than fewer, places where freedom is on the line, and the speed with which we can move to the defense of freedom will be of growing importance.

In a geographic sense, the world is shrinking simply because we now calculate movement times in hours rather than days or weeks as they once were, of necessity; and the Army, as a strategic hitchhiker service continues to rely on air and sealfit for the initial deployment of troops and equipment as well as resupply of those troops once we are in the area where the issue will be decided.

In a technological sense the world is shrinking as the fruits of research and development materialize and as ideas and information spread. Our knowledge of physical science is roughly double that which existed in 1950, and this price for failure to stay ahead or at least keep abreast of our adversaries in the scientific area may be measured not in time or dollars, but ultimately in cities and blood.

This shrinking world means for the United States more international involvement as well as more hazards; more military commitments to the defense of freedom, as well as more demands on our economic and military strength. Never before have the requirements been greater for dedicated, high-caliber talent in our Armed Forces, and for equipment and unit combat readiness which have no equal.

This represents the backdrop for the basic purpose of the Army within the defense team. Since June 14, 1776, the basic purpose for the Nation's landpower has not changed. However, the real world in which we must carry out that purpose is changing rapidly. Areas of potential and active turbulence are emerging in different parts of the world to disrupt, in various ways, the climate of order and stability so important to the peaceful adjustment of the changes underway.

Within these conditions of world change, it remains the role of the Army, with generous assistance from our Naval and Air Force comrades in arms, to carry out the landpower missions of the United States so that turbulence is reduced, stability is

preserved or restored, and peace is achieved without destruction of the institutions of society which exist under the rule of law. These landpower missions run all the way from roadbuilding by a battalion of engineers in the hinterland of Thailand, and frontier development in Alaska, through support of counterinsurgency efforts in South Vietnam, to manning the ground defenses against limited or general attacks in NATO Europe. In accomplishing these missions the U.S. Army of over 950,000 men and women has deployed 41 percent of its strength in 101 countries. As the finest Army in our Nation's history, it provides a sound base on which to build for the future.

On this occasion of the Annual Armed Forces Day Dinner, I salute the sons of an earlier day who wore our uniforms and pioneered the way, the sons of today who unflinchingly are defending freedom's ramparts, and the sons of tomorrow who will inherit our mighty defenses, and our faith in the rights of peoples to be free.

Thank you.

THE AVENUE OF UNDERSTANDING

(Mr. ICHORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, during the past week the communications media has utilized the Early Bird communications satellite in transmitting several programs of the public information variety across the span of the Atlantic Ocean. Those who have witnessed this tremendous innovation in television broadcasting certainly have seen history in the making.

I believe this achievement ranks with the laying of the transatlantic cable or the first transatlantic flight for now it is possible for the peoples of Europe and the United States to better understand each other through live television transmissions. Think of the heretofore unimaginable scope of events that now can be seen as they happen. The areas of politics and world affairs, music and art, and sporting events are but a few among the hundreds of subjects which may now be covered by the television media.

Hopefully, in the near future all nations of the world will be able to enjoy this advancement. I sincerely hope this remarkable feat will serve as the means to making transoceanic broadcasts the avenue of understanding.

All those who participated in this project are to be highly commended and congratulated, for they have made it possible to take a giant step forward in the march toward international understanding.

OUTSIDE MONEY INFLUENCING ELECTIONS

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I am again today introducing a bill which would prohibit campaign contributions from crossing State lines to influence congressional primaries and elections and to influence election for electors of the President. I urge the Congress to conduct hearings and study the whole area

May 3, 1965

A2105

picture along with other industries which want to sell their materials to Japan.

THE NORTH PACIFIC SALMON PROBLEM

Now, let me discuss the salmon problem, which involves, as far as the international situation goes, both conservation and jurisdiction.

Our principal quarrel here is with Japan, and involves the principle of abstention, where one nation supports a second nation in the latter's conservation effort. Chiefly affected is the Bristol Bay red salmon run, whose far-ranging migrations in the high seas has made them vulnerable to Japanese destruction.

Since the expiration of the 10-year minimum term of the North Pacific Salmon Convention, Japan has sought the elimination of the abstention for conservation provisions, to make more of this run of reds accessible to her high seas operation, which includes use of the 10-mile small mesh nets that kill the immature salmon, and relentlessly render useless the conservation sacrifices of American fishermen.

There have been negotiations; but recently, when leaders of our industry met in Washington, it was apparent that our State Department's policy was to defer and delay, while our fishery leaders urgently pleaded for firm and immediate attention, before this year's fishing season.

I say it is about time—no, it is time—for our Government to assert its firm intention to protect our salmon on the high seas. It is time we shocked the administration into action.

Very simply, I propose that the fishermen peacefully petition for redress of grievances. Instead of a boycott, I suggest that you and your brothers on the gulf coast, and on the Atlantic coast, and up and down the Pacific coast peacefully demonstrate, until, and if, future circumstances may call for extending such action to picketing imports, or to a boycott of Japanese goods.

In other words, I would delay the boycott that has been suggested to such time as the Japanese fishing fleet may actually commence taking our Bristol Bay red salmon. By June 1 it will be known whether or not the Japanese intend to harvest our Pacific coast fish as against Asiatic runs of salmon on the high seas. In fact, this is the intention of the Congress of American Fisheries.

Meanwhile, it seems to me that the voice of the Pacific Northwest fisherman should be heard, by petition to the President and to the Department of State. Your indignation should be registered strongly enough to be heard both in Washington, D.C., and in Tokyo.

There is no other way I know of to let the Japanese government recognize the seriousness of our problem. There is no other way I know of to stir the President, the State Department, and the entire Congress, into taking action to protect your rights.

Let us get the support of organized labor from the Seafarers' International Union, the culinary unions, and all others affiliated with the great brotherhood of fishermen.

Let's demonstrate peaceably, and petition in English and in Japanese, if necessary.

The time to act is here.

Captive Nations Committee

SPEECH
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join with my able and distinguished

friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], and others of my colleagues in urging immediate and favorable action on the resolution creating a special House committee on the captive nations.

Too long have we delayed the authorization for this committee, the very creation of which would hearten the suffering peoples of the captive nations and which in its hearings and its findings could be expected to bring under the limelight of the world and to the condemnation of all free nations the horrible and intolerable conditions forced upon the captive nations by a captor who knows no mercy and has respect for neither the laws of God nor the rights of men.

There should be no further delay. The creation of the special committee for captive nations should be a must on the agenda of every Member of this body, who loves freedom and abhors tyranny.

Student Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, this is the season of the year when parents, public officials, prospective commencement speakers, school officials, and others concerned with the present and future of our young people are likely to give special thought to this subject, to reflect on the alarming increase in juvenile delinquency as well as the contrasting record of youthful interest and participation in civic and school activities.

It is also the time of year when, on many school and college campuses around the country, students are demonstrating their sense of responsibility, their feeling of obligation to the student community, their active interest in helping to make campus life more meaningful and fruitful, by seeking election to class or campus office.

By doing so, these young men and women are once again refuting the easy charge that students these days "could not care less." They obviously do care, and by caring enough to do something about their own condition, they are also preparing themselves better to understand and more fully to participate in public life as adults.

As an example, Mr. Speaker, a young constituent of mine, Calvin E. Newman, a student at American University here in Washington, is a candidate for president of the class of 1968. Mr. Newman has a platform, and since it seems to me to be representative of the kind of thoughtful and constructive programs which student candidates are advocating, I include it as a part of my remarks.

I hope Mr. Newman and his fellow candidates everywhere this spring will find the experience of campus politics to be exciting and profitable but most of all to be an opportunity for useful service to their fellow students and their schools.

Mr. Newman's platform follows:

PLATFORM OF CALVIN EDWARD NEWMAN, CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENT, CLASS OF 1968

1. To unify the class:

(a) A class forum coordinated with the class council. Meetings of the council will be publicized in the Eagle, the university newspaper, with a summary of what has been accomplished at previous sessions, and what the members hope to accomplish at the next session. The student body en masse will be afforded the opportunity to take an active part in the procedure.

(b) Installation of FM radios in all dormitories on all floors. Five-minute programs will be broadcast each day during the 5-day week and for a half hour on Saturday, bringing a daily summation of class activities to all members of the class. Proctors on each floor will be responsible for tuning in the program at the designated time.

(c) Opinion sheets to be distributed to all members of the class on all important issues. The results of these sheets will give student government a definite base with which to work with the administration.

(d) Suggestion boxes to be installed in strategic places through which the student will be afforded the opportunity to address correspondence to a specific member of student government. This will serve two purposes: (1) It will give the student's interest a chance to be articulated. (2) It will give the member on student government a feeling of definite constituency.

2. To give our class and our school the facilities most other universities have.

(a) The institution of a football team.

3. To establish a system of tenure. At this time tenure is granted only according to the administrations will, not according to academic priority or seniority.

Rev. Arthur E. Hiley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Lowell, Mass., the Matthews Memorial Church paid tribute to its pastor, the Reverend Arthur E. Hiley, on the occasion of his voluntary retirement as pastor after 28 years of devoted service.

Reverend Hiley has a unique history with the Matthews Memorial Church. He attended the church as a boy growing up in Lowell, he was married in the church, his children were baptized and married in the church, and he was ordained there in 1927.

In addition to Reverend Hiley's ministry, he paid heed to community needs. He is a member of the Lowell Board of Health, and has participated actively in civic and religious affairs in the Greater Lowell area.

Prior to his pastorate in Lowell, Reverend Hiley held pastorates in Pascoag, R.I.; Methuen, Mass.; and Fall River, Mass. Both in Fall River and later in Lowell he served as president of local ministers' associations.

The esteem with which Reverend Hiley is held in Lowell was evident yesterday as he was tendered a warm reception attended by the mayor of Lowell, the chairman of the Lowell Ministers' Association, the president of the Greater Lowell

May 3, 1965

Council of Churches, and many more community and religious leaders. All of Lowell is in his debt for his fine example and dedicated service.

Many Misinformed on Pending Immigration Revision Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have recently become aware of much public misinformation about the pending immigration bill. Some of this misinformation may come from persons who oppose the bill but who have not studied it themselves or do not understand it very well.

I have prepared an outline that is designed to correct mistaken notions which have been circulated about the bill and to provide accurate information on its purposes and anticipated effects.

COMMON MISAPPREHENSIONS ABOUT H.R. 2580

Claim: The bill would bring in an excessive number of immigrants and thereby aggravate our population problems.

The facts: The effect of the bill on our population would be quite insignificant. Our population is now increasing at the rate of about 3 million a year. The total number of quota immigrants now authorized is 158,000 a year and under the bill would be about 166,000, an increase of 8,000 per year. Actually, because the bill would authorize the use of quota numbers that now are authorized but unused, it would result in an increase in immigration of about 60,000 a year. This figure is, however, only about 2 percent of the present natural increase in our population and obviously can have little practical effect on population growth.

The old days of large-scale immigration to this country are a half-century past, and no one has suggested any legislation to bring them back. The administration's bill certainly would not have that effect; it is designed to deal primarily with the basis on which immigrants are chosen and leaves their number little changed. If at some future time the amount of immigration were to become a real problem from the standpoint of our population or anything else, Congress always has the power to curtail immigration further, and probably would do so.

Claim: The bill would let in hordes of Africans and Asiatics.

The facts: As pointed out above, the bill would not let in great numbers of immigrants from anywhere at all. Persons from Africa and Asia would continue to be quota immigrants, as they are under present law, but would be treated like everyone else. With the ending of discrimination by place of birth, there will be some shift of immigration

to countries other than the ones in Northern Europe which are now favored by the national origins systems, but quota immigrants will have to compete and to qualify to get in, and quota immigration will not be predominantly from Asia and Africa. This is because there are many factors besides quotas that limit immigration, factors that the bill will not change. Actually, many countries in Africa do not use their present quotas of 100. The simple fact is that nations differ greatly in the number of their people who have the occupational attainments, or the family ties in the United States, to obtain a preference. There are also marked differences in wealth, earning power, and education which have a determining effect upon the numbers of people who could prove they would not be public charges if they came here, and who could meet the other prescribed tests for admission. Indeed, very few people from some areas can even pay the cost of tickets to come here. Because of practical and legal factors such as the above, quota immigration under the bill is likely to be more than 80 percent European.

Moreover, all countries will be limited by the bill to a maximum of 10 percent of the total quota immigration, so that no country could take up an excessive share of the overall quota. It should be noted that, in order to relieve hardship and for reasons of foreign policy, it would be possible under the bill to restore present quotas in some cases. This would, at least theoretically, allow the 10-percent limit to be exceeded in the cases of Great Britain, Germany, and Ireland. They happen to be the only countries whose present quotas exceed the 10-percent figures. The conclusion is plain—there would not be any flood of immigrants from any country, any continent, or from all of them put together.

Claim: The bill will lead to an increase in unemployment and in welfare rolls.

The facts: There is no real evidence to support this claim, and there is much evidence to disprove it.

First. Out of the 60,000 additional immigrants a year who would enter under the bill, only 24,000 would be workers. This number of additional workers is microscopic in relation to the U.S. work force—24,000 against our present work force of over 77 million, or about 1 to each 3,000 workers—hardly a drop in the bucket as a practical matter.

Second. For each additional worker admitted, the national economy will benefit from the admission of other persons who are consumers but not workers—elderly parents, women, children—in a ratio of workers to consumers that is as good or better than the ratio in our country today; these consumers should strengthen and not weaken the employment situation.

Third. The bill makes absolutely no change in the provisions of the present law, by which the Secretary of Labor can keep out immigrants who would take work from Americans or depress wages or working conditions here. The Secre-

tary of Labor has testified that enactment of the bill will not increase unemployment.

Fourth. Every immigrant under the bill will have to satisfy the public charge test of present law before he can get a visa. This test was proven, during the depression, to be effective in keeping out those likely to become a public charge, and it will continue to keep out persons who will be unable to get jobs or will be prospects for welfare rolls. Finally, the improved preference structure of the bill will help stimulate business and should thus reduce unemployment through better selection of immigrants with outstanding talents—men like Steinmetz, the electrical genius; Giannini, the banker; Sikorski, the inventor; Fermi, the atomic pioneer. Such immigrants, instead of taking jobs from Americans, help to create whole new industries that make thousands of new jobs for our people.

Claim: The bill would result in the admission of Communists, other subversives, or other undesirables.

The facts: The bill makes no change whatsoever in the safeguards of our present immigration laws which prohibit the admission of Communists, other subversives, security risks, narcotic addicts, persons with criminal records, illiterates, and other undesirables. Persons with mental afflictions also will continue to be generally excluded, except that if the afflicted person is an immediate relative of a family that can guarantee adequate and safe care here, without public expense, to the satisfaction of the Public Health Service and of the Attorney General, he can be admitted. This is true under present law for an immediate relative excludable for tuberculosis if adequate safeguards and guarantees are provided. Admissions of this kind are based on the humane policy of favoring family unity, provided the public is fully protected.

Claim: Under the bill an immigrant would no longer have to prove he has a job waiting for him.

The facts: This claim shows a misunderstanding of both the bill and the existing law. Under the present law immigrants generally do not have to prove that they have a specific job waiting for them. The bill makes no changes in this regard.

Under existing law, the only immigrant who must prove specifically that he has a job waiting for him is the immigrant who is seeking first preference. The law now provides for giving first preference within a quota to immigrants who can show extraordinary qualifications. This is a fine idea which in theory should strengthen and benefit our country, but in practice the present provision does not work well for two reasons:

First. Due to the national origins system, the preference is given only within a quota for a particular country. As a result, immigrants from undersubscribed countries can easily enter without having any special qualifications, while those from oversubscribed countries may be kept out for years no matter how much

May 3, 1965

A2107

they could do for our country. For example, a housemaid from a favored country may enter quickly while outstanding doctors and scientists from oversubscribed countries are kept out. Since the housemaid does not seek a first preference, she need not prove a personal job offer, while the doctor, even if he proves that a particular hospital wants him badly, must still wait.

Second. The present provision does not work because it tends to favor applicants with personal connections in this country rather than just extraordinary talents. This is true because no matter how outstanding an individual may be, most employers will rarely promise a job without an interview. Therefore, the applicant who cannot get here for an interview will usually get a job offer only if he is lucky enough to have good connections with the employer. The bill would eliminate the need for such connections and also place of birth as a factor in granting a first preference, which would be granted solely on proof of exceptional qualifications that would be especially advantageous to this country. People with such high qualifications will have no problem in obtaining employment. Naturally, no matter how high the qualifications of a first preference applicant, they could not be found especially advantageous to this country if he would displace an American from a job. And the applicant would also have to satisfy all the eligibility tests that other immigrants must meet.

Before You Leave This World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, one of my good friends who is active in civic and community affairs, Mr. Nathan E. Jacobs, has reduced his philosophy of life into a simple but beautiful poem, which I should like to share with my colleagues, as follows:

BEFORE YOU LEAVE THIS WORLD

When God put us on this earth,
He set no price upon its worth,
He asked us for no guarantee,
Nor did He tell us it was free.

He bade us welcome on that day,
And then He taught us how to pray.
He told us by our daily deed
Work would provide for what we need.

We needn't be captain of the team,
Although to many it may seem.
The fastest way to Our Lord's grace,
But to Him every man has his place.

He said: These things I ask of thee—
Love God, respect the law, everyone be
family;

Make of this earth a better place
Than when you came into the human race.

—NATHAN E. JACOBS.

False Guide for Deficit Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lawrence Fertig, author of the book "Prosperity through Freedom", had an article in the San Francisco Chronicle on April 30 which expressed some fundamental conclusions in regard to the handling of our unemployment figures as well as the unemployment situation as it exists throughout the country.

Mr. Fertig's column follows:

FALSE GUIDE FOR DEFICIT SPENDING

(By Lawrence Fertig)

Unemployment still hovers slightly under 5 percent, according to the latest Government estimate. This estimate is not just one among a number of important figures—it is a crucial statistic. For according to the newest economic theory it is the guidepost to our entire economy. Until there is full employment (currently defined as less than 4 percent jobless) Federal deficits must be employed as a "stimulant" and the budget must under no circumstances be balanced.

If the Federal Government is to pour out billions each year in an effort to reduce the unemployment figure below the accepted 4-percent rate, it is essential to ask some basic questions about this statistic—about the unemployment estimate that conditions our entire national life.

Year-after-year deficits would create a host of problems—ranging from the threat of rising prices to a depletion of our dwindling gold and an international monetary crisis. Here are the questions that require an answer. Is our current estimate of unemployment scientifically accurate? Is avoidable unemployment actually being created by our own national policies? Is adherence to an irrelevant and inaccurate statistic (unemployment) endangering the entire economy by building up a huge inflationary potential? In other words, do we really know what we're doing when we gear Federal deficits to an unemployment figure of 4 percent?

One answer was recently given by Arthur F. Burns, formerly chief of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers. He pointed out in a recent article in Harvard Business Review that there are more jobs available today than there are unemployed jobseekers. In that case, he says, "there is no deficiency of aggregate demand." Under these conditions any government which plans government deficits and easy credit is simply toying with inflation. Unless it is related to jobs available, the unemployment figure by itself is misleading.

Also misleading is the official U.S. unemployment statistic now taken as an infallible guide. This is arrived at by a sampling of 26,000 households in the United States—not by any head count of those actually unemployed.

Also, aren't we guilty of creating unemployment and then complaining that unemployment must be cured with monetary gimmicks? The highest unemployment (23 percent of the total) is among teenagers. The law says that a teenager cannot be hired for less than \$50 a week plus fringe benefits. This prevents many teenagers getting jobs from employers who cannot profitably pay

that rate. At some lower rates of pay many new jobs would be opened up. But new pressure is on for an \$80-a-week minimum wage.

Since it is only natural for employers to economize on labor when the cost is excessive, any rise in minimum wages would create still more unemployment in this group.

The minimum wage directly affects the unskilled, the physically handicapped, and the not-too-competent. Since all these people constitute such a large percentage of those unemployed, and since the minimum wage curbs their job opportunities, isn't it evident that we are actually creating unemployment despite our good intentions?

As for creating Federal deficits until the trigger-point of a 4-percent unemployment rate is reached, here is what a leading "liberal," Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, said in his book, "Economy in National Government," published some years ago: "In a period when unemployment is less than 6 percent there is no real supply of workers ready to go into productive activity. Instead the unemployed are primarily either the hard core of the perennially unemployed, such as the handicapped, or the transitionally unemployed for whom job opportunities exist * * *"

Senator DOUGLAS now repudiates the 6-percent figure and favors the 4-percent figure. When we reach 4 percent might he and others advocate 2 percent?

NAS Panel Completes Its First Assignment in Relationship With Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, on April 26, the Committee on Science and Astronautics met with a group of distinguished scientists, eminent in both the physical and social sciences, who had completed a yearlong study for our committee in regard to appropriate levels of Federal support for basic research.

This has been one of the channels, but only one, through which the Science Committee is carrying forward its duties. I might add that the detailed planning for this work was undertaken by Mr. DADDARIO, of Connecticut, the able chairman of our Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, and Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky of Harvard, former Presidential Science Adviser, who has been serving as chairman of the Committee on Science and Public Policy for the National Academy of Sciences.

The attached article, written by Daniel S. Greenberg, was published in one of the Nation's most highly respected scientific journals, Science magazine, April 30, 1965. I believe it will be useful and enlightening to all Members of the House.

The article follows:

ACADEMY AND CONGRESS: NAS PANEL COMPLETES ITS FIRST ASSIGNMENT IN NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH CONGRESS

For the first 101 years of its existence the National Academy of Sciences generally has been a body of men who have been called upon to advise the President of the United States on matters of science and technology. It has been a body of men who have been called upon to advise the President of the United States on matters of science and technology. It has been a body of men who have been called upon to advise the President of the United States on matters of science and technology.

May 3, 1965

maintained a cordial but distant relationship with the U.S. Congress.

The Congress had little reason to avail itself of the Academy's services as scientific adviser to the Federal Government. The Academy, repelled by the harshness and stringency of congressional politics, preferred to work with the executive agencies, and didn't seek to develop ties with Congress. But when budgetary and political pressures began to affect seriously Federal support for science, both the Academy and Congress showed more inclination to work with each other. Last year this new attitude resulted in a formal contract for the Academy to provide counsel for the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. The contract was shortly followed by the committee's first assignment for the Academy, a request for answers to two questions: (1) What level of Federal support is needed to maintain for the United States a position of leadership through basic research in the advancement of science and technology and their economic, cultural, and military applications and (2) What judgment can be reached on the balance of support now being given by the Federal Government to various fields of scientific endeavor, and on adjustments that should be considered, either within existing levels of over-all support or under conditions of increased or decreased over-all support?

The vagueness of the questions and their essential unanswerability inspired a fair degree of despair behind the Academy's marble facade. But there were the questions, reasonable ones from the point of view of legislators who must appropriate money, and the Academy accordingly turned to the task of answering them. The assignment was given to the Academy's Committee on Science and Public Policy, which set up a 15-member ad hoc committee, which in turn decided that, rather than seek a consensus, it would give the House Committee the separate views of all 15 members. Those views were delivered last Monday in a 310-page report, "Basic Research and National Goals." Except for a few humble and carefully circumscribed attempts, the papers don't try to answer the unanswerable, but they do provide some of the most provocative and best informed discussions yet to appear any place on the economic and political problems of Federal support for science.

Harvey Brooks, dean of applied physics and engineering at Harvard, provides a lucid analysis of the difficulties involved in trying to employ dollar amounts as a measure of scientific activity. Noting, for example, that the National Science Foundation reported Federal support for basic research to be \$1.6 billion in fiscal 1964, Brooks asserts:

"It turns out that nearly half of this amount was spent by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and that approximately 80 percent of the NASA expenditure was for the design and procurement of scientific space vehicles, the operation of tracking ranges, and payments to military missile ranges for putting the vehicles into orbit. A significant part of the oceanography budget," he continued, "goes into simply keeping research vessels at sea, without any science." These costs, he conceded, are necessarily incurred in the conduct of basic research, and are therefore legitimately chargeable to basic research. But, he noted, "A basic research budget that rises annually by 15 percent may appear to be adequate or even generous, but if most of the cost increase is merely to insure the availability of certain new facilities, then the increased budget could actually be supporting the activities of fewer scientists. The situation would be a little like building a new department store that was so expensive to keep open that it was necessary to fire all the salesmen."

Brooks went on to point out that "much of the planning for new research facilities that took place in fiscal years 1962 and 1963 was based on an implicit assumption of continuing expansion of research budgets. Now, in fiscal 1964 and 1965, when these facilities are just coming into operation, the expenses of merely making them available—without any science—are confronting fixed or even declining operating budgets for basic research."

To avoid this dilemma, Brooks recommended segregating the costs of major scientific equipment—such as accelerators, oceanographic vessels, and space vehicles—to distinguish them financially from the costs of performing research. In regard to Brooks' proposal it might be argued that the pie is still the same size, no matter how it's sliced. But in terms of congressional attitudes, the proposed budgetary distinctions might be extremely significant. When research budgets are lumped together, Congress tends to pay attention to overall growth, rather than to the financial problems of any particular segment; it is therefore tactically difficult to plead poverty when the overall sums are rising substantially.

The panelist who was most provocative and most out of step with his colleagues was Harry G. Johnson, Chicago economist. Addressing himself to the contention that science should be supported because of its cultural value, Johnson stated:

"The argument that individuals with a talent for research should be supported by society, for example, differs little from arguments formerly advanced in support of the rights of the owners of landed property to a leisured existence, and is accompanied by a similar assumption of superior social worth of the privileged individuals over common men. Again, insistence on the obligation of society to support the pursuit of scientific knowledge for its own sake differs little from the historically earlier insistence on the obligation of society to support the pursuit of religious faith, an obligation recompensed by a similarly unspecified and problematical payoff in the distant future. At the more popular level, the interest in scientific accomplishment represents a leisure time activity, more elevated than following professional sport and less culturally demanding than the appreciation of artistic endeavor, and hence peculiarly appropriate in the affluent mass society."

Johnson said that "there is no disputing that basic research has played a significant part in the growth of the U.S. economy," but he said that it was difficult, if not impossible, to determine the extent, and like most of his colleagues on the panel he declined to attempt to answer the questions posed by the House committee.

Among the few panelists who attempted to provide direct answers to the House committee's questions were Brooks and George Kistiakowsky, of the Harvard chemistry department. They took the position that a minimum annual increase of approximately 15 percent in university research support is essential to meet national requirements. Brooks also suggested "that 10 to 15 percent of the applied effort might be a good rule of thumb for the basic research effort." John Verhoogen, University of California geologist, suggested that in "little science"—designated by research costing less than \$20,000 a year—"ideally every scientist who is capable of raising a valid scientific question and contributing significantly to its solution" should be supported. He estimated that this would apply to at least 50,000 scientists. As for "big science," there was general agreement that because of its costs, there was a necessity to pick and choose among possibilities. And there was also general agreement with a view most forcefully advanced by Edward Teller, of the University of California, that

graduate science training places insufficient emphasis on applied science.

One area of considerable agreement among the panelists was the view that the future of basic research in the United States is becoming closely tied to the fortunes of the National Science Foundation, and that increased support for NSF is essential if research is to thrive.

Alvin Weinberg, director of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, warned that Government agencies with narrowly defined technical objectives have been reducing their support of basic research because of budgetary pressures. "Whether or not basic physical science continues to flourish," he said, "will therefore depend largely on whether or not Congress encourages the growth and vigor of the Foundation. Expansion of the National Science Foundation is perhaps our country's central political problem related to the support of science."

The House committee for which the report was prepared received it with a warm statement of appreciation. Chairman GEORGE P. MILLER, Democrat, of California, said: "It is my belief that this report represents not only genuine achievement and utility in itself, but a significant milestone in congressional methods of gathering talented, objective assistance to its use."

It appears, however, that the academy, whose panelists labored with great diligence to produce their papers, is not so certain that a lengthy compilation of individual views is actually the best way to serve the requirements of busy Congressmen.

The introduction to the report disclaimed any group responsibility for the views of the individual authors, stating that "neither the other members of the ad hoc panel, nor the committee (on science and public policy), nor the academy assumes responsibility for the opinions expressed, except where explicitly stated." In explaining why it chose to present 15 papers rather than a committee report, it offered the statement that "it has been traditional for groups of this kind to develop a consensus as a basis for unanimity in the public statement of their findings addressed to the executive branch of the Government. We concluded that, in view of the nature of the legislative process, this may be less desirable in a response to a request from a congressional committee."

Just why this should be the case wasn't made clear. But it is possible that the Academy is still uneasy about its new relationship with Congress and wants to feel its way before committing its prestige fully. One thing in favor of a closer relationship is the scientists' respect for Representatives EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, Democrat, of Connecticut, chairman of the House committee's Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development. It is generally agreed that DADDARIO has been running his subcommittee in a responsible and intelligent fashion, and that the subcommittee is developing into an important channel of communication between the scientific community and the Congress.

Members of the Academy's Panel on Basic Research and National Goals who participated in the preparation of the report to Congress are:

George Kistiakowsky, Harvard University, chairman; Lawrence R. Blinks, Stanford University; H. W. Bode, Bell Telephone Laboratories; Harvey Brooks, Harvard University; Frank L. Horsfall, Jr., Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research; Harry G. Johnson, University of Chicago; Arthur Kantrowitz, Avco-Everett Research Laboratory; Carl Kayser, Harvard University; Saunders MacLane, University of Chicago; Carl Pfaffman, Brown University; Roger Revelle, Harvard University; Edward Teller, University of California, Berkeley; John Verhoogen, University of California, Berkeley; Alvin M. Weinberg, Oak Ridge National Laboratory; and John E. Willard, University of Wisconsin.

May 20, 1965

A2511

10,000 automatic weapons. It will be interesting to learn who manufactured those weapons being used on that little Caribbean island.

Importance of restoring order to this little republic and keeping it free of communism is seen in the fact that President Johnson has sent about 14,000 U.S. troops to the island. That's about half the total of all U.S. forces in Vietnam.

Welcome or not, U.S. forces are on that Caribbean island for one main reason—to restore a democratic system of government. In doing so, they will accomplish two important actions—driving out the Communist influence and giving the people a renewed lease on freedom.

Schweiker Fair Immigration Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for new immigration laws—laws which will eliminate once and for all the discriminatory aspects of our immigration policy.

Ours is a nation of immigrants. We have built our greatness from the outcasts of many lands. The persecuted, the oppressed, those who were not wanted elsewhere—all of these found refuge upon our shores and contributed to the making of our mighty Nation. We should never forget that our humble origin had its foundation in the efforts of people who were oppressed elsewhere. I hope that this quality of our history will guide us in humility to eliminate invidious discrimination in regard to our present citizens and in regard to future immigrants. I feel this quality of America in a most personal way. My ancestors came to settle in Pennsylvania as members of the Schwenkfelder sect fleeing religious oppression in Germany. They yearned for peace; they yearned for a place where they could enjoy religious freedom; they yearned for an end to their oppression. If the gates of America had not been open to them at that time, I would not be here before you as a Member of Congress today.

We must keep in mind these aspirations of the oppressed. At the same time we must realize that our own population is growing with great rapidity, that opportunities which existed in 1620, in 1840, or in 1910 are not the same as the opportunities in 1965. Frankly we no longer need large numbers of people to populate frontier wilderness areas. We must reckon with a population explosion within our own borders. We must consider the unemployment of at least 5 percent of our working population. Our Nation is already populated from coast to coast. Today we must seek the skills and talents which new immigrants can bring to our shores. We must seek the quality of their contribution to our Nation, not the quantity of numbers.

Let us fashion a new law which eliminates all discrimination on the basis of national origin and asks only of a man

what he can contribute to the American civilization of 1965.

Because I am so deeply concerned with the nature of our future immigration laws, I have introduced this week my own immigration bill, H.R. 8502. I am in general agreement with the basic purpose of H.R. 2580, the administration measure, but I feel that certain important improvements incorporated in my bill are necessary. The Schweiker bill, like the administration bill, would eliminate the discriminatory national origins system devised in 1924 and would establish a preference schedule for immigrants which is based on skills and talents rather than upon race and nationality. The Schweiker bill would also phase out existing quotas over a 5-year period. The admission of immigrants on a first come, first served, skill criteria basis would be a built-in feature. But there are certain problems which the Schweiker bill would reach which the present administration bill does not reach. For example, the Schweiker bill would:

First. Eliminate all national origin preference of immigrants, including existing preferences for Western Hemisphere nationals;

Second. Establish an annual ceiling of 315,000 to cover all immigrants, both quota and nonquota;

Third. Endorse emergency migration for all political refugees without giving national origins preference to any particular geographic area;

Fourth. Avoid possible influx of unskilled labor at times of high national unemployment by using better controls than H.R. 2580 provides;

Fifth. Establish a Selective Immigration Board rather than the proposed mixed congressional and executive Immigration Advisory Board.

1. ELIMINATE ALL NATIONAL ORIGIN PREFERENCES

The administration bill does not reach the desired goal of eliminating national favoritism. The administration bill favors nations of Latin America and North America. It favors nations of northern Europe. It is our task to remove all hypocritical aspects of our present immigration policy. We must fashion a new law which will be completely nondiscriminatory as written and applied.

All nations want equal treatment; all nations deserve equal treatment. Nations of the free world should have an equal chance to send their citizens here. The administration bill quite clearly does not place all nations on an equal basis. Written into H.R. 2580 is the potential for new preferential treatment.

The administration bill would offer preferential treatment to nationals from Western Hemisphere nations by maintaining for them special nonquota status. This preference has existed in the past. It should be abolished. Unless we settle this problem finally, by eliminating all national preferences, questions may be raised in future years as to why a citizen of Peru or Bolivia is given an open door for entry while an applicant from France, Italy, or the United Kingdom must wait in line under the quota system. This inequity can be solved by repealing section 1101(A)(27)(c) title 8, United States Code—Immigration and Nationality Act.

2. ANNUAL IMMIGRATION CEILING OF 315,000

I recommend an annual immigration ceiling of 315,000 to cover both quota and nonquota immigrants. The administration measure contains no ceiling figure on immigration. Presently we accept an average of 273,000 immigrants yearly—95,000 under quotas and 178,000 non-quota immigrants. I suggest, with the administration, full use of quotas to allow immigration of 158,361 yearly. But I also recommend holding nonquota immigration to 156,639 in order to keep within the suggested 315,000 ceiling, an increase of 42,000 over the average total number of immigrants now entering this Nation yearly. In this way we shall be able to advise the American people with full candor the number of immigrants to be expected each year. This will help allay the fears of some opponents of the administration bill that the new law would generate a tremendous increase in immigration.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk has said, and I agree with him:

It would not bother me to say to anyone outside the United States, we are sorry that we cannot admit you because we have run out of numbers.

But it does make it difficult from a moral, political, and psychological point of view to say: "I am sorry but we have run out of numbers for Greeks, or Italians, or Canadians." With the suggested ceiling of 315,000 there would still be adequate room for political refugees to enter as nonquota applicants.

3. EMERGENCY MIGRATION FOR POLITICAL REFUGEES WITHOUT GEOGRAPHICAL FAVORITISM

It has been traditional American policy to offer asylum to the politically oppressed. The administration bill engages in geographical favoritism by singling out one area, the Middle East, for special mention in its provision for political refugees. Certainly there will be persons outside "the general area of the Middle East" who will qualify in the future as politically oppressed. I see no reason to single out the Middle East for special mention in the administration bill. I would point out that our Nation is already participating magnificently in efforts to alleviate the plight of refugees in the Middle East, under the fair share law, Public Law 86-648, under Public Law 480, the food-for-peace program, and by cooperating with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to settle refugees, many of them from the Middle East, in the United States.

4. AVOID INFLUX OF UNSKILLED LABOR CREATING UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM

Section (10)(A)(2) of the administration bill offers a fourth preference to immigrants capable of performing specific functions for which a shortage of employable and willing persons exists in the United States. I believe tighter restriction should be placed on the immigration of persons who might possibly compete with the existing U.S. labor force at a time when at least 5 percent of our working population is idle. Often the claim of "shortage of employable and willing persons" is without foundation.

I recommend strongly that the Congress make clear its intention that, be-

A2512

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 20, 1965

fore any person is admitted under the proposed fourth preference—

First, The Secretary of Labor be required to find that a labor shortage for the specific functions which the immigrant would perform does, in fact, exist and cannot be filled by U.S. citizens;

Second, The Attorney General be in possession of written evidence of the willingness of U.S. employers to hire immigrants for this specific function; and

Third, The immigrant applicant worker be required to show written proof of a job offer for this specific function and his intention to accept the offer.

Only after these three steps are satisfied should the fourth preference provisions become operative. The Schweiker bill contains these provisions.

5. ESTABLISH IMMIGRATION BOARD WITHIN EXECUTIVE

The administration bill creates an Immigration Board consisting of members from both the executive and legislative branches. This mixed membership seems inadvisable. I recommend that the Immigration Board be part of the executive branch without congressional membership. Congressional oversight would be maintained by requiring periodic reports from the Board. The Schweiker bill would create a Selective Immigration Board in the executive branch similar in composition to the Federal Power Commission. The Board would promulgate regulations under the new law, continuously study immigration conditions and recommend allocation of the quota immigration visas under the 10 percent allocated for the politically oppressed.

Mr. Speaker, there is another serious defect in H.R. 2580. Statistics indicate that of the 158,361 quota positions available in 1964, northern European nations received 81 percent, southern European nations 17 percent, and the rest of the world only 2 percent. The United Kingdom never uses half its quota of 65,361, while the quota of 100 for the Philippines is backed up for 90 years and the quota of 308 for Greece, 325 years. Other nations also suffer this hardship of severe oversubscription. This hardship deprives applicants for an entire lifetime of realizing their dreams of life in the United States. The proposed administration bill would make it quite possible for this hardship now suffered by nationals of Italy, Greece, and other nations with backlogged, small quotas to be sustained by future Presidential action.

The administration bill would allow the President to take 30 percent of a reserve pool, intended to benefit victims of the deprived small quota countries, and assign this 30-percent reserve instead to northern European nations which have enjoyed preferential large-quota treatment for the past 45 years. Most of the nations which might be so affected—Germany, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, United Kingdom, Belgium, and France—do not come close to using their present quotas. There is no reason to expect a sudden substantial increase in the number of their citizens seeking to come to the United States. This 30-percent outright grant has no valid statistical or foreign policy basis.

By placing the burden of choosing between nationals of one country over another, on vague undefined criteria such as national security or hardship, we would rewrite preferred treatment into our new law.

There is apparently no reason for the provision other than to increase the President's power in a field where Congress has traditionally reserved policy decisions to itself. The proposed gradual reduction of large country quotas over a 5-year period, by only 20 percent, will avoid the possibility of hardship accruing to these large quota countries. When we look at the small waiting lists for these large quota countries, we realize that each of the present applicants will have a chance to be admitted during the 5-year phase out period of the national origins system. No hardship will result. The suggestion that hardship for large quota countries may result is not supported by available statistics. Furthermore, we would do more for the national security of our Nation, by completely eliminating the possibility of preferential treatment. Otherwise we shall irritate the feelings of friendly nations outside northern Europe who will be disadvantaged by the 30 percent technique. Such Presidential discretion, and its prospective use, will undercut the very purpose of this bill. I am convinced that this delegation of power, which has been reduced from 50 to 30 percent since last year, does not deserve a place in this bill. This section simply reinstates the possibility of discrimination in favor of northern European nations. I do not favor such possibilities.

Mr. Speaker, many years ago one of our great Presidents, Woodrow Wilson, in an address given at Independence Hall in Philadelphia on July 4, 1914, gave a definition of liberty which applies to our efforts today. Wilson stated:

Liberty does not consist in mere general declarations of the rights of men. It consists in the translation of those declarations into definite action.

We must translate the declaration of liberty into definite action as part of our new immigration laws. Our task is not merely to give a partial response to the demands for change. Our task is to create a clear, comprehensive, and completely fair law. It is time now to offer true equality to all applicants who seek membership in the American community.

The Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act of 1965

SPEECH
OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7303) to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH] such time as he may consume.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Although I realize that each disaster brings its own problems, it does seem to me that the Alaska disaster and the disaster in the Northwest and the more recent disaster in the Middle West caused by floods and tornadoes have pointed out certain deficiencies which exist in our Disaster Act that are pertinent to each disaster. This was particularly brought home to me as I examined the Disaster Act as it related to the Palm Sunday tornadoes which swept from one side of my district to the other, leaving a path of devastation, destruction, and death such as we have never seen.

I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if his committee may not be considering taking a good look at our present Disaster Act with the view of updating it and covering some of these areas which are not covered presently by legislation?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. It is the sense of the committee that we reexamine in detail the Federal policy with respect to disaster relief. It is our intention to deal with that subject when we hold hearings on the omnibus flood control bill this year. As the gentleman from Indiana has pointed out, we will make a homesite study of the upper reaches of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers.

Next week we will go down to the Texas area for an examination of the damages as a result of the flood that recently occurred there. I can assure the gentleman we will welcome his suggestion and at the appropriate time, we will take it up.

Mr. ROUSH. I direct the gentleman's attention to certain provisions which I have included in a disaster act which I recently introduced, particularly provisions dealing with relief to individuals who have been adversely affected and provisions dealing with assistance to small unincorporated communities that have been adversely affected. I think these two areas in particular need attention.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The committee will certainly welcome suggestions made by the gentleman from Indiana because we know they will be worthwhile and valuable to the committee.

Mr. ROUSH. I thank the gentleman.

Postal Service Progresses?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the Record an editorial from the Bennett County, S. Dak., Booster, which

June 1, 1965

In California alone, there are nearly 14,000 more U.S. workers on farms this year than last. The Government estimates that last year, Mexican farmworkers earned about \$36 million, and spent only \$6 million in this State.

As a result of new minimum wages which growers must pay if they want foreign workers, and because of the lack of low-wage imported labor, U.S. farmworkers are earning up to 50 percent more than last year.

As for crop production, L. N. Gardner, head of the Department of Agriculture's market research office here, said: "California production of fruits and vegetables this year is slightly higher overall than at this time last year, despite the bitter complaints from growers of heavy crop losses."

Prices of some crops are higher, but "in view of the increased volume generally, it is difficult to attribute the price increases to labor shortages," he said. Lettuce production is higher than last year, even though California winter lettuce from the Imperial Valley was actually held back from the market by "harvesting holidays" because growers reached agreement on quotas to try to stop lettuce from flooding the market, Gardner said.

As of the last full reporting date of May 13, there were 19,138 carlots of lettuce shipped from California compared to 19,096 at this time last year, he noted. Prices are now higher than last year for lettuce, but at the start of the year, were down to about \$2 a carton compared to \$5 last year. Supplies of lettuce are still heavy, Gardner said. He added that the only explanation he could give for continued high volume and high prices is that "housewives decide what they will pay" and "the vagaries of the weather."

Tomatoes are also going out in greater number this year—10,419 carlots so far compared to 10,130 last year. Some growers are blaming Mexican imports for taking away U.S. production because of lower labor costs in Mexico. But nationally, Mexico has sent the United States only 5,690 carlots of tomatoes this year compared to 5,713 carlots last year at this time.

Asparagus shipments by rail are up to 1,713 carlots compared to 1,452 last year, while prices for the growers are higher.

Strawberries also are being produced in larger quantity than last, although more are going to processors who freeze and can the berries.

Oranges are slightly behind in normal production rates, but while the fruit may stay on the trees longer, and so increase in size, Gardner said the total crop volume of navel oranges should be about the same this year as last.

Florida this year had a bumper crop which causes the price of canned orange juice to drop sharply.

Lemons are being harvested more slowly this year than last. This will mean more going to the processors, which brings a smaller return to growers than when the fruit is sold on the fresh market.

[From the International Potter, May 1965]

A WORKING SECRETARY

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz is a working Presidential Cabinet member if ever there was one. In order to learn the problems connected with migrant agricultural labor, Secretary Wirtz recently made trips to the big corporate farms of California and Florida.

He went into the fields and talked with the workers. He talked with their wives and their children. He went into the shanties which they must call home. He listened to them tell of their problems and frustrations. He looked at the almost totally inadequate sanitary facilities as human beings are forced by circumstances to live in structures which would not be used as chicken houses on many respectable farms.

The large corporate farms and farmer cooperatives have been pressuring the Labor Department to admit more foreign low-wage workers. Secretary Wirtz has been resisting these pressures in behalf of the American agricultural workers who would be deprived of even these paltry wages if foreign workers take their jobs. In addition, society would be injured as displaced U.S. workers were forced onto relief rolls.

Farmers along the U.S.-Mexican border want more Mexican braceros admitted, claiming that available U.S. workers cannot do the job. Farmers in Florida want Jamaicans admitted, claiming that there are not enough field workers available. Wirtz went to the scenes to check the facts for himself.

The pictures on this page [not printed in the Record] speak three things. They tell eloquently of the plight of these unfortunates caught on the fringes of misery. They secondly pay mute tribute to a dedicated, hard-working, industrious Secretary of Labor. Finally, they bespeak an object lesson on what often happens to workers who are gloriously free of any necessity to pay union dues.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 1, 1965]

WIRTZ SAYS FARM CHANGE IS BOON

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz said yesterday that the increased use of Americans for seasonal farmwork in California is having a favorable effect on both employment opportunities and welfare rolls.

In a report on the California farm situation, Wirtz said that on May 15 domestic seasonal farm employment was up 16.1 percent from a year ago and that the number of families receiving welfare aid in the farm areas was down sharply.

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. SWEENEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONSTITUTION OF TUNISIA

(Mr. FARNUM (at the request of Mr. SWEENEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, 1959, a constitution that in many respects is similar to our own, was promulgated for Tunisia, which had been among the free nations of the world since March 20, 1956.

This ancient land has much in the past to be proud of, and under President Habib Bourguiba is following a policy that promises to make its modern history also noteworthy.

Over 3,000 years ago Phoenicians had established various communities, including the famous city of Carthage, there. In the seventh century A.D., a new historic chapter opened when the area became a major center of Western Islamic culture and political power. After a later period of Turkish rule, Tunisia became a French protectorate in 1883 and a stirring for independence began to manifest itself.

This was given drive and purpose in 1934 with the founding of the Neo-Destour—New Constitution—Party, of which

Mr. Bourguiba soon became president. In the struggles for freedom that followed he came to be called supreme combatant—a title as meaningful to his people as "Father of His Country" is to us.

We may be proud since that we have in several ways—through providing economic and technical assistance as well as surplus agricultural commodities—aided the new nation in its struggle to assume a proud place among the free nations of the world.

In offering our congratulations to the people of Tunisia, and to President Bourguiba on this anniversary, we should also extend our greetings to two other outstanding individuals. One, of course, is Bahi Ladgham, a famous Neo-Destour leader, and the other Mongi Slim, who before he was called home for even more important responsibilities was Ambassador to United States and that proud nation's representative in the United Nations.

IMMIGRATION

(Mr. ROSENTHAL (at the request of Mr. SWEENEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to reaffirm my strongest support for the administration immigration program, which I am cosponsoring through my bill H.R. 6022.

This legislation is long overdue. Four Presidents of the United States have urged changes in our immigration and naturalization procedures. They and the greater body of American citizens have strongly demanded the elimination of the national origins system. Yet, for too long, such action has not been forthcoming from the Congress. Mr. Speaker, the idea of altering our immigration regulations so as to eliminate the national origins system has been proposed again and again. We cannot let that idea escape us once more. The time for action is now, in this year 1965, by this 89th Congress.

For all too long, America's immigration and naturalization laws have been in conflict with our national history and ideals. Before the institution of the national origins system, this country accepted new citizens on the basis of their own personal qualities, and their commitment to our democratic ideals. Yet now our present policy actually discriminates among applicants for admission into the United States on the basis of accident of birth. The national origins system thus implies that people from one country are more desirable than people from another. This is a proposition our history has rejected from its earliest years.

Oscar Handlin, perhaps the most authoritative student of American immigrant history, had said:

Once I thought to write a history of immigrants in America. Then I discovered that the immigrants were American history.

This is a sentiment which John F. Kennedy reinforced in his memorable study, "A Nation of Immigrants."

In one way, we are all immigrants. None of us can afford to ignore the debt

June 1, 1965

this country owes those people who came here to find a new life and take up new citizenship. We offered them a prize by granting citizenship. But that grant was paid back a hundredfold by their contribution to our life. We cannot allow this legacy to be blemished. Yet many throughout the world know only our present discriminatory policy. Suggestions of our rich democratic past are met with skepticism and doubt. And this skepticism is often the existence of our national origins system.

If that system is unfaithful to our past, it also corrupts our present. This country is now involved in a great struggle against the forces of discrimination and the apostles of bigotry. Our national energy and conscience are committed to that fight and its quest for equality. The past Congress dramatized that commitment when it passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Yet the same specter of discrimination, which we so firmly oppose in our domestic affairs, still appears beneath the surface of our immigration and naturalization policies. Such an inconsistency cannot be allowed to remain untouched. What may appear to some as a technicality, appears to others throughout the world as a deep injustice.

The national origins system is archaic as well as unethical. It seems clear to me that the effect of the national origins has deeply confused our immigration procedures. The system heavily favors northern Europeans who rarely fill their quota, and severely limits immigration from southern and eastern Europe, Africa, and Asia where there a lengthy waiting lists. Over 90 percent of the total immigration quota is reserved for European countries. Due to its inflexibility the McCarran-Walter Act actually governs only about one-third of total immigration to the United States. The majority of immigrants enter under private immigration legislation. Surely we can devise a program which is more in touch with present realities.

The proposed new immigration program is based on a technique of preferential admissions which seeks to attract to our country persons with exceptional skills, training or education. It acknowledges the special continuation of that tradition, and replaces the unethical system of national origins quotas. Yet we are not concerned simply with attracting skilled foreigners to our country. A newly defined immigration policy will be humanitarian as well. We should have provisions which take into special account cases where families are needlessly separated from one another by out-of-date regulations. We will continue and fortify provisions which admit political refugees and refugees from catastrophe.

The central feature of a new immigration and naturalization program, however, must be the elimination of the national origins system. We must repair the damage done to those who have been denied entrance to this country on the basis of outdated procedure and unjust criteria. In so doing, we must, for example, be prepared to permit quota numbers not used by any country to be made

available to countries where they are deeply needed. We must eliminate the highly discriminatory provisions dealing with the newly independent countries of the Western Hemisphere. We must do away with the Asia-Pacific triangle program. These proposals have been reached after the careful and deliberate consideration of experts in the executive branch. They have the earnest leadership of a President who well understands the significance of American immigrant history.

Our goal, therefore, should be a policy which is in the best traditions of our past and in the best interests of our future, a policy which is sanctioned by our democratic code of ethics, a policy which fortifies rather than compromises our foreign policy, and a policy which, above all, treats all men as human beings to be judged solely on their qualities as individuals.

(Mr. BOLAND (at the request of Mr. SWEENEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. BOLAND'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. MATSUNAGA (at the request of Mr. SWEENEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MATSUNAGA'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF THE CLAY-LISTON FIGHT

(Mr. SWEENEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, last week this Nation recoiled in disgust at one of the most nauseating sports demonstrations in our history. To say that the Clay-Liston engagement was a new low for boxing is a masterpiece of understatement.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Government for some time has been undertaking the responsibility of proceeding in the protection of the American consuming public. President's commissions have been created for this purpose to study and investigate consumer fraud. I would heartily recommend that Mrs. Esther Peterson, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, undertake an investigation of the Clay-Liston fight.

It would certainly qualify as a consumer fraud from one end of the country to the other. Sports fans assembled in theaters to view a telecast of a supposed legitimate encounter between two heavyweight contenders. Millions of dollars were involved in this fight promotion. Those attending these telecasts were victimized by two pretenders who were putting on a sham performance, the net affect of which can only bring on the demise of boxing as a legitimate sport.

(Mr. VIVIAN (at the request of Mr. SWEENEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. VIVIAN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

MOTION ADOPTED BY THE SECOND CHAMBER OF THE STATES-GENERAL OF THE KINGDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS WITH REGARD TO THE EVENTS IN VIETNAM

(Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. SWEENEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under date of May 20, 1965, I received a letter, with enclosure, a copy of a motion adopted by the Second Chamber of the States-General of the Kingdom of the Netherlands at the Hague, sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives by the President of the Second Chamber of the States-General of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the Honorable F. J. F. M. van Thiel, which I herewith include in my extension of remarks:

THE HAGUE,
May 20, 1965.

THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER AND COLLEAGUE: During its meeting on May 18, 1965, the Second Chamber of the States-General has adopted a motion with regard to the events in Vietnam.

Pursuant to the wording of the penultimate paragraph of this motion, I have the honor to enclose herewith the English translation of it. I should be grateful if the document could be distributed among the Members of your House.

Yours sincerely,
F. J. F. M. VAN THIEL,
President of the Second Chamber of the States-General.

[The 1964-65 session, 8083]

EVENTS IN VIETNAM—MOTION OF ORDER INITIATED BY MR. RUYGERS ET AL.—No. 2—MOVED ON MAY 18, 1965

The Chamber—after hearing the debates on events in Vietnam, holding the view that Peiping China's attitude is the main cause of the increased tension and that the United States is entitled to understanding and support from her NATO partners in her ultimate political objective, viz, to check Communist China's expansionist policy in Asia—requests the Government to help, in international political consultations, to bring about (1) a truce that will put a stop to any direct or indirect aggression, thus reducing the risk of the war spreading and constituting the basis for unconditional negotiations; (2) a political settlement of the conflict—based on the Geneva Conventions of 1954—under appropriate international supervision; and (3) the active participation, after cessation of hostilities, by as many European countries as possible in the large-scale aid program for southeast Asia announced by President Johnson.

The Chamber resolves to bring this motion to the notice of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives and to the Parliaments of the European NATO partners; and passes on to the order of the day.

June 1, 1965

11629

Mr. DENT. Yes; I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I am delighted that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] has offered this amendment to the amendment, because without it a very careful reading of the amendment would indicate that unless an owner or operator is actually served and at the meeting, he would not be covered by the provisions of this act. I feel certain that was not the intent of the author of the original amendment.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment to the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS], as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MADDEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3584) to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines, pursuant to House Resolution 391, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

If not, the Chair will put them en gros. The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes had it.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 335, nays 43, not voting 55, as follows:

[Roll No. 117]

YEAS—335

Abbutt	Fountain	Mills
Adams	Fraser	Minish
Addabbo	Fulton, Pa.	Mink
Albert	Fulton, Tenn.	Minshall
Anderson, Ill.	Fuqua	Mize
Anderson, Tenn.	Gallagher	Moeller
Andrews	Gialmo	Monagan
Glenn	Gibbons	Moore
Andrews, N. Dak.	Gilbert	Moorhead
Annunzio	Gilligan	Morgan
Ashley	Gonzalez	Morrison
Ayres	Grabowski	Morse
Baldwin	Gray	Mosher
Baring	Green, Oreg.	Moss
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Multer
Bates	Greig	Murphy, Ill.
Battin	Gridler	Murphy, N.Y.
Beckworth	Griffin	Murray
Belcher	Griffiths	Natcher
Bennett	Gross	Nedzi
Betts	Grover	O'Brien
Bingham	Gubser	O'Hara, Ill.
Blatnik	Gurney	O'Hara, Mich.
Bolling	Hagen, Calif.	O'Konski
Bolton	Haley	Olsen, Mont.
Bow	Halleck	Olsen, Minn.
Brademas	Halpern	O'Neill, Mass.
Bray	Hamilton	Ottinger
Brooks	Hanley	Patman
Broomfield	Hanna	Patten
Brown, Calif.	Hansen, Idaho	Pelly
Broyhill, N.C.	Hansen, Iowa	Pepper
Broyhill, Va.	Hansen, Wash.	Perkins
Burke	Hardy	Philbin
Burleson	Harris	Pickle
Burton, Calif.	Harsha	Pike
Burton, Utah	Harvey, Mich.	Pirnie
Byrne, Pa.	Hathaway	Poage
Byrnes, Wis.	Hawkins	Poff
Cabell	Hays	Pool
Cahill	Hechler	Price
Callan	Helstoski	Pucinski
Cameron	Herlong	Quile
Casey	Hicks	Quillen
Cederberg	Hollfield	Race
Chamberlain	Holland	Randall
Chelf	Horton	Redin
Clancy	Hosmer	Reid, Ill.
Clark	Howard	Reid, N.Y.
Clawson, Del.	Hull	Relfel
Cleveland	Huot	Reinecke
Clevenger	Ichord	Reuss
Cohelan	Irwin	Rhodes, Pa.
Conable	Jacobs	Rivers, Alaska
Conte	Jarman	Roberts
Conyers	Joelson	Rodino
Cooley	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers, Colo.
Corbett	Johnson, Okla.	Rogers, Fla.
Corman	Johnson, Pa.	Rogers, Tex.
Craley	Jones, Ala.	Ronan
Culver	Jones, Mo.	Roncalio
Curtin	Karsten	Rooney, N.Y.
Curtis	Kastenmeter	Rooney, Pa.
Daddario	Kee	Roosevelt
Dague	Keith	Rosenthal
Daniels	Kelly	Rostenkowski
Davis, Wis.	King, Calif.	Roudebush
Dawson	King, N.Y.	Roush
de la Garza	King, Utah	Roybal
Delaney	Kirwan	Rumsfeld
Denton	Kluczynski	Ryan
Derwinski	Kornegay	St. Onge
Devine	Krebs	Saylor
Dingell	Kunkel	Scheuer
Dole	Laird	Schisler
Donohue	Langen	Schmidhauser
Dow	Latta	Schneebell
Dowdy	Leggett	Schweiker
Downing	Lennon	Secrest
Duncan, Oreg.	Lipscomb	Senner
Dwyer	Long, Md.	Shirley
Dyal	Love	Shriver
Edmondson	McCarthy	Sickles
Erlenborn	McCulloch	Sikes
Farbstein	McDowell	Sisk
Farnley	McFall	Skubitz
Farnum	McGrath	Slack
Fascell	McVicker	Smith, Calif.
Feighan	Macdonald	Smith, Iowa
Findley	MacGregor	Springer
Fino	Machen	Stafford
Flood	Mackay	Staggers
Flynt	Mackie	Stalbaum
Fogarty	Madden	Stanton
Foley	Mahon	Steed
Ford, Gerald R.	Mailliard	Stratton
Ford	Martin, Mass.	Stubblefield
William D.	Matsunaga	Sullivan
	Matthews	Sweeney
	May	Talcott
	Meeds	Teague, Calif.

Teague, Tex.	Van Deerlin	Whitener
Tenzer	Vanik	Widnall
Thompson, La.	Vigorito	Willis
Thompson, N.J.	Vivian	Wilson, Bob
Thompson, Tex.	Waggonner	Wolff
Thomson, Wis.	Walker, N. Mex.	Wright
Todd	Watkins	Wyatt
Trimble	Watts	Wylder
Tupper	Weltner	Yates
Tuten	Whalley	Young
Udall	White, Idaho	Younger
Ullman	White, Tex.	Zablocki

NAYS—43

Abernethy	Everett	Morris
Ashmore	Frelinghuysen	O'Neal, Ga.
Aspinall	Gathings	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bandstra	Gettys	Rivers, S.C.
Bell	Goodell	Satterfield
Brock	Hagan, Ga.	Scott
Buchanan	Henderson	Selden
Callaway	Hungate	Smith, Va.
Carter	Jennings	Stevens
Colmer	Jonas	Tuck
Davis, Ga.	McEwen	Walker, Miss.
Dorn	McMillan	Whitten
Duncan, Tenn.	Marsh	Williams
Edwards, Ala.	Martin, Ala.	
Ellsworth	Martin, Nebr.	

NOT VOTING—55

Adair	Edwards, Calif.	Miller
Andrews	Evans, Colo.	Morton
George W.	Evans, Tenn.	Nelsen
Arends	Fallon	Nix
Ashbrook	Fisher	Passman
Berry	Friedel	Powell
Boggs	Garmatz	Purcell
Boland	Hall	Resnick
Bonner	Harvey, Ind.	Robison
Brown, Ohio	Hébert	St Germain
Carey	Hutchinson	Smith, N.Y.
Celler	Karth	Taylor
Clausen	Keogh	Thomas
Don H.	Landrum	Toll
Collier	Lindsay	Tunney
Cramer	Long, La.	Utt
Cunningham	McClory	Wilson,
Dickinson	McDade	Charles H.
Diggs	Mathias	
Duiski	Michel	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Passman with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Duiski with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Thomas with Mr. Robison.
Mr. Carey with Mr. McDade.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Toll.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Karth.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Resnick.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

June 1, 1965

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND
REMARKS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] may extend his remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Bill file Immigration

H.R. 8662—A BILL TO ESTABLISH A SELECTIVE IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced H.R. 8662, a bill to establish a selective immigration system. This bill is a result of a year's hearings by the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of which I am chairman.

In addition to the extensive public hearings, I have had several conferences with President Johnson and we have examined the full range of problems involved. I have advocated simultaneous repeal of the national origins quota system and the nonquota status for natives of the independent countries of the Western Hemisphere. I am advised by Government spokesmen that repeal of the nonquota status for natives of the Western Hemisphere would be inopportune at this time. Accordingly, my bill repeals immediately the national origins quota system and the Asia-Pacific triangle concept but leaves intact the privileged immigrant status of natives of the Western Hemisphere.

I have a special order for 1 hour later today at which time I will explain the major provisions of my bill.

SECRETARY FOWLER GIVES WELL-DESERVED SPANKING TO HIGH-INTEREST LOBBYISTS

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Henry H. Fowler, our able new Secretary of the Treasury, addressed the prestigious Committee on Economic Development on May 27 in New York City. Mr. Fowler's address dealt primarily with our balance-of-payments situation, and I am happy to report that the administration takes most seriously its responsibility to end the deficit. Mr. Fowler's statement is very well reasoned, but at the same time quite understandable for the layman. It also has a determined tone which is reassuring to everyone that

we are going to lick this gold problem. Of special importance is the Secretary's warning to those inflammatory voices, located around Wall Street, who scream incessantly for tighter money and higher interest rates. Mr. Fowler gave a well-deserved verbal spanking to those who believe all we have to do to solve the payments problem is increase our interest rates. He said:

Unfortunately, such a course not only conflicts with our need to maintain our domestic expansion but also important, would not solve the problem. In view of the tremendous difference in size and efficiency between the money markets here and abroad, it is hardly realistic to expect a higher interest rate to provide the necessary reduction in long-term capital outflow. Furthermore, an interest rate increase large enough to have a significant effect in this area would almost certainly bring a recession. A recession in turn, would severely damage the climate for foreign investment in the United States and would also create a strong movement to reduce interest rates immediately.

The entire statement follows:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE HENRY H. FOWLER, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, TO THE COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, IN THE STARLIGHT BALLROOM OF THE WALDORF ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK, N.Y., MAY 27, 1965

For the first quarter of 1965, our balance-of-payments deficit dropped to an annual rate of slightly more than \$3 billion.

That was half the rate of the final quarter of 1964.

More important, after a bad start in January, our position improved to show a surplus in March and—on the basis of preliminary figures—hopefully in April.

While it is still too early to assess the impact of President Johnson's program to reduce private capital outflows through the voluntary cooperation of the banking and business community, it appears that this program is already helping to improve our position.

Let me caution you vigorously against interpreting these results as indicating that the battle has been won. We must, at all costs, avoid undue optimism. We cannot afford any premature relaxation of our determination or our efforts.

Solving our balance-of-payments problem will be a long, hard, and difficult task, but it is a task I believe to be vital to continuing our political as well as economic leadership in today's world.

The United States has had 14 balance-of-payments deficits in the past 15 years.

During those 15 years, our deficits have totaled \$35 billion. One out of every four of those dollars of deficit has been settled in gold.

The time has come to put a stop to this chronic deficit. We can eliminate it, we must eliminate it, and we will eliminate it.

The elimination of the deficit is at once the most serious and the most difficult economic task facing the United States today.

The task will not be easy. For the last 4 years, our balance of payments has engaged the best efforts of bold and imaginative men.

Many of the steps taken have been highly successful in reducing part of the deficit. But each time the deficit was held down in one place, it bulged out in another. In fact, we have been plagued by a series of deficits arising from a different mix of causes from year to year.

Putting an end to the deficit will require strong determination and firm action. A successful program to achieve equilibrium must attack the deficit on all fronts.

President Johnson launched just such a program with his February 10 message to

Congress on the balance of payments. My purpose today is to tell you why that program is necessary, why it must work, and what sort of a situation we will face when it has worked.

In the early part of the 15-year period referred to our deficits served to reduce the so-called dollar shortage. For that reason these deficits were appropriate, since dollars were needed to finance expanded world trade and nourish the redevelopment of Western Europe and Japan.

For the second part of our deficit period—1958 through 1960—our deficits reflected inadequate trade surpluses combined with rising expenditures for defense and foreign aid.

Long-term private capital outflow also rose during this period, as European recovery led to a substantial increase in U.S. private investment abroad. Finally, in 1960, the rising tide of speculation against the dollar contributed to a sharp increase in short-term capital outflow.

The first comprehensive program to reduce the payments deficit—which had averaged almost \$4 billion for the 3 years 1958–60—was presented in a message to Congress in February 1961.

This program was designed to minimize the balance-of-payments impact of necessary Federal spending abroad; to reduce short-term capital outflow by restoring confidence in the dollar; and to expand our trade surplus by launching (a) a vigorous campaign of export promotion and (b) a program of special tax incentives for investment to help cut costs combined with policies, wage-price stability, both designed to increase our national competitive edge in markets at home and abroad.

Over a period of 4 years—1961–64—the efforts initiated under this program yielded results which totaled more than \$3.5 billion, including increased commercial trade surpluses (\$900 million); reduced overseas dollar spending for foreign aid (\$400 million); economies in military spending abroad (\$200 million); increased military offset sales to foreign countries by the Defense Department (\$450 million); and an increase in profits and interest on past foreign investments (\$1.6 billion).

But the deficit failed to narrow a corresponding amount.

The reason it did not was that just as this vigorous attack on several different areas of our deficit was gathering momentum and beginning to show increasing progress, a new problem appeared. Early in 1963, the outflow of U.S. private capital into foreign securities rose alarmingly because, in part, inadequate capital markets in the remainder of the industrialized world made recourse to our money market the easy and cheap course for all who needed capital.

This required the second program to control the deficit, which was contained in the balance-of-payments message of July 1963.

The interest equalization tax proposed in that message was immediately effective in stemming capital outflow into foreign securities. Last year, for instance, the total of such foreign borrowing was cut more than 65 percent below the rate for the first half of 1963. The program also intensified other existing programs and utilized monetary policy by combining an increased rediscount rate with measures which raised short-term interest rates substantially.

But the net result of all of these efforts achieved only a reduction in our overall deficit of \$800 million—from \$3.9 billion in 1960 to \$3.1 billion in 1964.

Why? Because last year another new problem appeared—the marked rise in overall private capital outflow, including both short- and long-term bank credits and direct investment abroad.

It was clear that action was necessary to meet this new challenge. It was equally

makes, reflecting a passion for thoroughness which has marked his football career from its earliest days.

Those days were spent in Ohio, where Don was born in a small town about 30 miles east of last December's disaster. He went to Catholic grade school, and in high school, he and his five brothers and sisters all took part in sports. Don won 11 letters. "Sports was all I ever had—whatever was in season." After high school, he went on to John Carroll University in Cleveland, where he was a sociology major. He kept up a B average while participating in collegiate sports, and in his senior year was captain of the football team.

He graduated in 1950 and was offered a teaching job in a high school in Canton. He also found himself a ninth draft choice of the Cleveland Browns. "There was a decision to make then," he says. "I decided in order to have peace of mind, I had at least to try pro ball and see if I could make it." He played two seasons with the Browns, taking a master's degree in physical education at Western Reserve and doing a hitch in the National Guard at the same time.

He came to Baltimore first in a trade in 1953 when the Colts were reactivated. He was never a standout as a player, although Weeb Ewbank did once rate him as his best defensive back. Don early established himself as a perfectionist, spending hours practicing football on his own. It was said of him that he could run backward almost as fast as he could forward. Assistant coach Charlie Winner said what he lacked in actual ability he made up in brains.

Don was released by the Colts in 1957 as Ewbank was trying to mount strength for the first drive toward the championship. It was a case of youth versus experience, Don says, and one of the toughest things that ever happened to him. He was picked up by the Washington Redskins and finished the season there, but was coming to realize that his best playing days were probably behind him. He turned almost naturally to coaching. "It had appealed to me for a long time," he says. "Besides my own assignment, I always wanted to know what everybody else was doing. I always had an interest in the whys and hows of the game." He accepted an offer as assistant coach at the University of Virginia, stayed one season, then went to the University of Kentucky where he worked under Blanton Collier, who is now head coach of the Cleveland Browns. After a year at Kentucky, he got a call from George Wilson, coach of the Detroit Lions, who was looking for a defensive backfield coach with NFL experience, and Don found himself back in pro ball.

He was married and had a young son by this time, and moved his family to Allen Park, a Detroit suburb. On the field he was what the players called a "holier guy," whose deep voice could be heard all over the gridiron when he found occasion to chastize one of his charges. He worked in Detroit for 3 seasons, in each of which the Lions finished second.

One day toward the end of 1962, Don came home and asked his wife, Dorothy, how she would like to move to Baltimore. The Colts were looking for a new head coach, and despite his youth and relative inexperience, he thought he had a chance at it. Colt owner, Carroll Rosenbloom, considering about a dozen prospects, is said to have made up his mind on Shula on the basis of his answer to one question: did he think he was ready for a head coaching job? Don's reply: "It doesn't make any difference what I tell you about that. I'd have to prove it. That's by winning."

Don was hired in January 1963, becoming the third coach since the team returned a decade previously and ending the 9-year regime of Weeb Ewbank. Don had just turned 33 and was, by a few weeks, the sec-

ond-youngest head coach in the NFL. Rosenbloom admitted that he was taking a gamble on Shula, but was sufficiently impressed with his studious approach to the game and the job he had been doing for the Lions to take the chance.

Don's forthrightness and sincerity helped him avoid what might have been a crippling pitfall. He was coming in to coach a team he had once played for. Some of the players were former teammates, and some were older than he was. "I didn't anticipate any problems, and had none," he says. "I believe it was mainly because I was always honest with them and treated them all the same." Gino Marchetti quipped that he saw no reason to worry: "Shula used to give us hell when he was just a player."

Brief though it had been up to that point, Don's coaching career had a lot of facets. "I've been brought up in the Paul Brown philosophy of coaching. It started out at John Carroll where we used to use all Brown stuff. Then I started to play with the Browns. When I came to Baltimore, I found that Ewbank was a student of Brown also. Then I got into coaching. I was under Blanton Collier, and there again it was back to the same system: organization, attention to detail, eliminate errors. This is what I've tried to do. Our practices are highly organized, for example. They're not long but we get a lot done. There's not much standing around. You just don't tolerate any mistakes. You get a guy who makes repeated errors and sooner or later he's going to beat you, and if you can't depend on him, you look for somebody else."

"Detroit is the only place I've been as a coach that's been different, and I learned a lot there from George Wilson. He was not only a fine coach but was a real great handler of men, and this helped me, to see how he handled the pros. I learned a lot from Ewbank, too. He was a fine organization man and did a good job of getting the squad prepared. And I have my own ideas about running a team—I haven't tried to copy anybody. I try to profit by my experience yet be myself, because I think if you pattern yourself after anybody, you're not natural, you're not doing the things that got you as far along as you are." Partly for this reason, Don rarely sends a play in from the bench. He says he firmly believes that the quarterback on the field is in a better position than the coach on the sidelines to estimate and analyze the opponent's defenses.

Don's dedication to the game is such that football consumes most of his waking hours. He never developed any outside business even as a player. "I've had a few opportunities, but I've never felt that I was able to do two things at one time. I just had to concentrate on one thing. I feel that football's been good to me and it's given me the opportunity to be here and I'm going to give it back everything I have, make the most of the opportunity. I'm going to either make it or break it in football."

His only regret is that the job consumes so much time that he would like to devote to his family. To the regular off-season duties a coach must perform this year was added the round of banquets and appearances that go with being Coach of the Year. There were about 60 such functions all told, an average of 3 a week between January and May. There's a danger of putting on weight, but Don has kept his down to 210, just 5 pounds more than he weighed as a player. And he'll lose those 5 pounds during the season if this year is like the past, which he attributes to being "a little more nervous."

His family now consists of five children, two boys and three girls ranging from 6 years to 2 months. They live in Campus Hills, near Towson, where they have plenty of room and a pleasant, fenced-in lawn. Don plays some golf for recreation when he can get to it, but not during the football season. "He always

shines up his clubs and puts them away before training camp opens," says Dorothy, "which is typical of him. Around the house he picks up after himself. He's particular about how his clothes look and about what we call his football room in the basement, where he has his game pictures and footballs and other souvenirs. He doesn't like that room to be upset, unless it's something the children have just done. With kids, he's mellowed a little around the house. He appreciates a neat mess."

The Shulas are a religious family—Don goes to mass in Westminster every morning during training camp. He's normally even-tempered, but when things go wrong, he can explode. "We had some television people up in camp this year getting some background for the 'Countdown to Kickoff' program. They had a mike on me and everything I said during practice was recorded. A lot of times I don't like everything I say to be recorded," he laughs. "They can always use it against you, especially when you have a tendency to say just what comes to your mind and not think too much about it."

As to the life expectancy of a head football coach, Don has come to be philosophical. He now has a 3-year, continuing contract, one which renews itself from year to year. "This is a little bit of security in a sense," he says. "But you've got to say that your job is determined by winning games. You can be the greatest talker or con man or what have you, but when it comes to the end of the year, they look pretty much at that record. I'm in a situation with the Colts where there's a lot of talent and you're expected to win, and it's pretty hard to explain when you don't."

If hard work and confidence in himself and the team will do the trick, Don will lead the Baltimore Colts out onto the field at Memorial Stadium on Sunday, January 2, 1966, to meet the eastern division titleholder for the championship. And if winning that game depends on winning it, nobody stands a better chance than Don Shula.

THE PAINFUL REALITY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on Tuesday, September 14, I spoke on the floor of the Senate in opposition to the recently enacted legislation—then under debate—revising our U.S. immigration laws in the manner proposed.

I pointed out that advocates of the legislation claimed that the increase in immigration brought about by its passage would be minuscule and would amount to only a few additional thousand persons annually, but that I feared the practical results would be otherwise.

I questioned why our Nation should be the only advanced Nation in the world to develop a guilt complex concerning its immigration policies, when it has always been far more liberal than other countries in this respect. I emphasized the fact that other advanced nations, realistically and in their own national interests, are selective in dealing with immigrants—without apology. I stated that our first responsibility in matters of immigration, at this point in our national history when we are faced with numerous sociological and economic problems of mounting severity, is to the citizens of our Nation.

I called attention to the sure indications of our changing times and urged that we take cognizance of the realities of our present situation and the forecasts for our future.

In the Washington, D.C., Evening Star, of October 11, the able newspaper columnist, Mr. Eric Severeid, a widely traveled and skilled political analyst, cogently warned of the difficulties which our Nation surely faces as a result of the enactment of our new immigration law.

I ask unanimous consent to have the October 11 article by Mr. Severeid printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPENING GATES TO IMMIGRANTS

(By Eric Severeid)

Fidel Castro will be very happy to get rid of more Cubans who have relatives in the United States, and the United States will take them. The American humanitarian instinct outweighs the American sense of Realpolitik which tells us that we are hereby easing one of Castro's burdens.

Not all the quarter-million or more Cuban refugees in this country have been economically assimilated, but most have, even in Miami, the social tone, variety and charm of which has been improved by their presence, not damaged.

This is not because these people are Cubans rather than Brazilians or Dominicans or Trinidadians. It is because, for the most part, these Cubans represent the aspiring, hard-working and responsible elements in the Cuban society.

It was because of them that pre-Castro Cuba enjoyed one of the highest, not one of the lowest rates of per capita income in Latin America. It is partly because of their banishment that Cuba now suffers one of the lowest rates.

Simply put, what the Cuban Communists have done is to gut the Cuban middle class, not just the small, exploiting upper class. This is profound, historical tragedy because the whole drive in Latin America must be to build middle classes by training the poor and illiterate as well as by reducing the power and holdings of the very rich.

It seems axiomatic: Without a strong middle class in those countries, that is to say, without a balance wheel which permits tolerance and orderly change, there is no escape from dictatorial rule, either by the right or by the left. In modern times, the existence of stable democracy is intertwined with the existence of a middle class.

President Johnson made his affirmative response to Castro's "offer" at the same time he signed the new immigration bill. Many statistics have been bandied about as to the past totals of foreigners admitted here and the future expectations under this bill. The most common characteristic of these figures, so easily spouted from political soap-boxes, is their meaninglessness. American citizens do not understand what the picture has been and will be, and the press has not done very much to enlighten them.

The welcome to a new wave of Cubans is an example of why the official figures never stay put. The new bill puts a limit of 120,000 per year on immigration visas from the Western Hemisphere. Many thousands more enter under different kinds of visas. The new Cuban wave will drive the total that much higher.

The bill eliminates the noxious quota system of 40 years standing, under which people from northern Europe were preferred as immigrants, even though those countries do not fill their quotas, presently prosperous as they are.

In recent years, "quota immigration" stood, on paper, at 158,000 a year, which will now be increased slightly. Most people seem to think that is the total of our annual harvest of newcomers to these shores. In fact,

the total of nonquota newcomers—refugees, reunited families, etc.—has been averaging far more than the number who actually come by quota.

The grand total of foreigners admitted has been running around 275,000 or more each year. Under the new bill, the grand total, by some expert estimates, will rise to somewhat near 400,000 a year.

It will now be easier for people of southern Europe, Asia, and Africa to come here, but the common notion that they have been virtually inadmissible is not quite true.

The Italian quota, for example, was only 5,600 a year, but the actual admissions from Italy have averaged over 15,000 a year for 10 years. Japan's quota was only 185, but the Japanese admitted annually have been averaging nearly 5,000 for the last 10 years.

Very few people will argue that the old quota system, based on religious and racial feelings, should have been retained. Few will argue against reuniting families or in favor of closing the door against political refugees in certain circumstances.

But responsible Americans, particularly the orthodox liberals, must now face up to certain hard, unpleasant realities and must think about them with their heads, not with their glands.

This is a basically different country from the time when immigrants were not only welcomed but required. The economic life of America in the revolution and the early 19th century was more like the life of ancient China than like the life of America today.

Farmlands no longer need filling up; they are, indeed, emptying into the vast urban centers. Our really terrible problems are urban problems and at the heart of most of them is the simple business of overcrowding. Sanitation, health, transportation, police services are at the point of breakdown in many cities. Psychological tensions have become unbearable in some cities, as we have seen in our long, hot summers.

The age of mass mess has just begun, for the population of this country will probably increase by another 30 million in the next 10 years.

It is in this light that we must now think about immigration, not in the light of old theories and emotions. To pile tragedy upon tragedy is scarcely liberal. Liberalism was an easy path when help given to one unfortunate did not injure another unfortunate.

The real, and the painful question that now has to be faced is not whether to be liberal or illiberal, but whom to be liberal to. Choices must be made. This is the sad wisdom that every older civilized country understands and acts upon because it must. History will not exempt the American civilization.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in just a matter of months now, medical care for the aged will no longer be the dream that it was almost a half-century ago. Instead it will be a reality—a reality made possible in no small part by the historic struggle of one of this country's most illustrious citizens, Josephine Roche, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

As far back as 1915 Miss Roche has highlighted, in one way or another, the health deficiencies of this Nation that needed correction. In her writings, in her speeches, and in her everyday work, she has relentlessly fought for better health and better medical care for this country.

Her earlier efforts were climaxed when she organized the Interdepartmental

Committee to Coordinate Health and Welfare Activities in July 1938. As chairman of this committee she called the first National Health Conference. This conference was attended by members of the medical and related professions, by public health and public welfare officials, by workers in health and social agencies, and by representatives of labor and farm groups, and of other groups composing the general public. The conference contributed toward a better understanding of the national needs in the field of health and medical care and toward the formulation of policies that would enable the medical and other professions, private organizations, Federal, State, and local agencies and individual citizens to cooperate in efforts to meet those needs.

The following is a brief summary of the work that led to the creation of that conference:

In June 1934, subsequent to a Presidential Executive order establishing the Cabinet Committee on Economic Security and the Advisory Council on Economic Security, the President appointed her as a member of this Council. In November 1934, she was appointed by the President as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and thereupon appointed to the Technical Board on Economic Security composed of specially qualified Government officials. This Board was responsible for the review and the analysis of the vast data on national economic and social needs, the proposals for meeting these needs, and for the preparation of the Cabinet Committee's report on economic security which was submitted by this Committee to the President January 15, 1935. The President, on January 17, 1935, transmitted this report to the Congress with his message recommending legislation along the lines proposed by the Committee. This report formed the basis for the Social Security Act passed by the Congress in August 1935.

Upon passage of the Social Security Act with its far-reaching new economic and social programs involving both Federal and State administration, the President requested her to act as Chairman of the Interdepartmental Committee To Coordinate Health and Welfare Activities of the Federal Government with particular reference to Federal-State relationships in these new programs. Due to the success achieved by the Committee during its first year of functioning in developing efficient and coordinated procedures for prompt implementation of the many new provisions contained in the Social Security Act, the President formalized the Committee's status a year later by Executive order.

As Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, the U.S. Public Health Service, then a Treasury agency, was placed under her administration and she immediately made plans for a comprehensive inventory of the Nation's health needs under the immediate direction of this outstanding professional agency. The mass data and material obtained and documented throughout every State over a period of months and subjected to expert analysis and compilation is still considered major

blasted a crater in the desert 100 feet deep and 200 feet in diameter.

The explosion, a forerunner of a planned nuclear blast, in the same area, is a study in "digging" techniques which could be used in digging the proposed sea level complement to the Panama Canal.

The event, Mr. Speaker, is graphically explained by Mr. O. A. (Gus) Kelker, feature editor of the Times-News, published in Twin Falls, Idaho, in the October 3 edition of the paper.

The article follows:

BRUNEAU DESERT BLAST MAY LEAD TO NEW CANAL

(By O. A. (Gus) Kelker)

MOUNTAIN HOME.—It actually sounds too strange to be true and yet the first shovelful of dirt which will result in construction of a new sea level canal across Central America was probably moved Thursday afternoon in the form of a piece of Idaho's desolate Bruneau Desert country.

The experiment, which came about as a result of 3 years of planning and study, was in the form of a great explosion, probably the biggest manmade blast to ever take place within the boundaries of the State.

It was the forerunner for a proposed 100-kiloton nuclear cratering project which may be undertaken in the same general area in about 3 years. This is the method of dirt and rock removal which someday may be used to dig the big ditch which is now in the planning stage.

The awe-inspiring explosion which ripped the solid rock of the Bruneau area took place at a point 2 or 3 hours away from Mountain Home by car or truck, depending on the speed you drive. It was more than 70 miles of bumps and dust which stretched out into nowhere.

A joint venture of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Corps of Army Engineers nuclear excavation research program, the project came down to the last day with scheduled projects ticking off like a well-oiled clock.

The last 24 hours, before the explosion was detonated and ripped a hole 200 feet wide and 100 feet deep in the desert rock, were a headache. In fact they almost resulted in the blast being scrubbed.

After the liquid explosive called nitromethane had been poured into a 36-inch access hole and filled a mined spherical cavity approximately 18 feet in diameter, a leak developed.

The leak was spotted by instruments and after it was confirmed officials ordered two trucks in from the atomic site near Las Vegas, Nev. They were to bring 55 more drums of the explosive. But this scheduled departure set off a chain of events not expected. One truck broke down near Las Vegas. The other gave up before reaching the test site in Idaho. Two smaller standby trucks were dispatched and the load of 23 drums of explosive was transferred.

These two trucks arrived at ground zero and the liquid was transferred below the ground. The countdown began but a few seconds before the big blast was to take place it was halted.

The 15-minute countdown finally was undertaken once more and this time the end result was something to behold.

On the second at the end of the count the desert not more than 3,000 feet from where photographers, newsmen, officials, project personnel, and others stood, heaved in a pattern that was both grotesque and beautiful at the same time.

So overpowering was the great earth move-

ment, with heavy dust and great pieces of rock rising more than 3,000 feet into the air, that it was difficult to comprehend. The great dust cloud, studded with rock, seemed for awhile to threaten the area where the observers stood, but it was all an optical illusion. The blast was so mammoth that the mind was unable to take it into consideration with only one sweep of the imagination.

The long wait, the desert travel and the dust and heat were forgotten at the instant of the spectacle. For most of the observers this thing was a first and it will never be forgotten.

As one newsmen put it:

"The gates of hell itself could not be more terrifying than the turmoil which we saw today."

One thing was certain, and as a result data which will be important in future tests—even of the atomic variety—was written into the book.

Because of the leak, the explosion took place with about 12 tons less nitromethane than was planned, and yet the results were greater than anticipated.

Checked and rechecked figuring on the curve had shown that depth of the crater would be about 41 feet, plus or minus 5 feet, and radius would be 76 feet, plus or minus 9 feet.

When the dust and rocks had settled and experts and observers trudged up to the crater's lip they found that it was about 100 feet deep and 200 feet in diameter. The lip of the newborn crater resembled a mountain on the level plateau.

The entire project was dubbed Pre-Schooner II. The big blast was associated with three other separate 1.2-ton TNT calibration shots.

Above ground, these three detonations a good distance from ground zero shoved shock waves through the air which were easily felt by observers. The big blast did not produce any appreciable shock wave because of the underground location of the charge.

But in the case of the big one, the ground shook like a great earthquake was underway and was easily noticeable where observers stood more than 3,000 feet away from ground zero.

The U.S. Army Engineer Nuclear Cratering Group, Corps of Engineers, is headquartered at the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore, Calif. The Atomic Energy Commission experts were from the Nevada test range.

Actual purpose behind the detonation was to improve the knowledge of crater dimensions in hard, dry rock as a function of depth of burst and type of explosive.

WARNING BALLOON

As a precaution prior to the blast, a bright yellow balloon, anchored to the ground by cable, was flown at a height of several thousand feet.

It served as a warning to possible flights of aircraft in the area and also held a set of instruments aloft to gain pressure measurements above the blast area. It was hoisted more than an hour before detonation time.

The data obtained from the experiment will be used in the design of the proposed Schooner atomic cratering project and in the general development of a theory of cratering and techniques for predicting slope stability and other engineering properties of nuclear craters.

Results of the blast will end in months of study before final tabulations are made, officials said.

But to the casual observer the entire project could be nothing short of a complete success.

It was the biggest blast in the State's history and the rumble of it will be heard for years to come.

The Pope at the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1965

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, many persons have discussed and sought to analyze the historical impact of the visit of His Holiness, Pope Paul VI, to the United Nations this Monday. In his eloquent essay of Thursday, October 7, Mr. Walter Lippmann captured the central meaning and full promise of this unprecedented event. I would like to commend Mr. Lippmann's words to all, as follows:

THE POPE AT THE U.N.

(By Walter Lippmann)

On Monday, when the Pope came to the United Nations, we witnessed an event of which we shall be able to appreciate the significance only as time goes on. His journey and his address were a blinding illumination in which the immediate consequences will only gradually become visible. "We are the bearer," said the Pope, "of a message for all mankind," and, he went on to say, "like a messenger who, after a long journey, finally succeeds in delivering the letter which has been entrusted to him, so we appreciate the good fortune of this moment, however brief, which fulfills a desire nourished in the heart for nearly 20 centuries."

The letter which the Pope was at last able to deliver said that the church, now at peace with all mankind, was able to ratify the purposes of the United Nations, which is a human institution aspiring to be universal. That has never been possible before. Never before has there existed an institution in which there is a place for all the nations of the world. The moral ratification of the United Nations, which the Pope declared on Monday, could be given by him only after the Roman church had reached a religious peace—only after the religious wars and persecutions of the past had been brought to an end.

This historic act of ratification marks the progress made under the inspiration of Pope John XXIII in the rejuvenation of the church. The modernizing church has brought itself into the mainstream of human affairs. It has done this by committing itself to the religious reconciliation of mankind, and also by making itself no longer the support of reaction and privilege but, "the voice of the poor, the disinherited, the suffering, of those who hunger and thirst for justice, for the dignity of life, for freedom, for well being and progress."

This is the Johannine church, of which Pope Paul is a faithful and convincing apostle, and there is now new hope in the world because this enormous transformation has gone so far.

We must realize that the moral ratification of the United Nations by the Catholic church does not mean and cannot mean the moral ratification of the policies and the behavior of all the member states, even of our own. The Pope spoke with great gentleness. But what he said so gently cut to the quick. No one who heard him attentively, or will read him now, can fail to realize that he was speaking a different language from that which is current and conventional. In fact, the Pope, who is without pride and has nothing to fear, was thinking what is unthinkable.

October 8, 1965

able for so many, and he was saying it out loud.

His conception of the secular world is quite different from the conception which underlies public discussion—be it in Peiping or in Washington. The crucial difference is that in the Pope's address the paramount issue is not the cold war of hostile ideologies. Although religion in general and the Roman church in particular have been treated as the chief enemies of the Communists, the Pope said that the pursuit of peace transcends all other duties, and that the paramount crusade of mankind is the crusade against war and for peace.

This is a different set of values than are accepted as righteous in the public life of the warring nations. The Pope was, of course, intending to make this known, and he reached the climax of his message, so it seemed to me, when he declared that the root of evil in this angry, hostile and quarrelling world "is pride, no matter how legitimate it may seem to be, which provokes tension and struggles for prestige, for predominance, colonialism, egoism; that is, pride disrupts brotherhood."

We shall have heard the Pope's message when we have taken these words to heart.

A Commemoration of Nikola Petkov

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 8, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on September 23, 1947, a brutal blow was dealt to the cause of human freedom and self-determination.

On that day 18 years ago Nikola Petkov, courageous leader of the opposition to the Soviet Communist takeover of the proud country of Bulgaria, was executed on the charge of "conspiracy against the state and the Soviet Union."

The murder of Nikola Petkov shattered virtually all Bulgarian hopes of resisting Soviet domination and preserving national independence. It dramatically marked the end of all legal political opposition to the entrenchment of communism in Bulgaria.

To commemorate the day on which Nikola Petkov was hanged for his efforts in behalf of Bulgarian independence, the Bulgarian National Committee scheduled a memorial meeting and reception at the Carnegie Endowment International Center on September 18 and a requiem mass at the Russian Orthodox Church of St. Nicholas in Washington, D.C., September 19. The committee is to be commended for commemorating the bravery of Nikola Petkov and of the Bulgarian resistance movement which he led.

Communist oppression and economic exploitation of the Bulgarian people have only intensified their longing for ties with the people of the Western World. The Bulgarian regime is gradually being forced to relax its rigid control and to grant the economic, political, and cultural contacts with the West which have been denied to the courageous people of this country for so many years.

Opportunities for increased human freedom in the liberalization of Communist control in Soviet bloc countries have been recognized by my Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

The subcommittee conducted hearings on the Sino-Soviet conflict and its implications earlier this year. In the report issued, the subcommittee recommended providing the countries of Eastern Europe with the incentive and leverage they need to remove themselves from complete economic dependence on the Soviet Union by expanding commercial trade of nonstrategic items with these countries. In addition, the subcommittee suggested intensifying political and cultural relations with those European Communist-controlled states who are achieving a degree of independence from Moscow and are showing moderation in their external affairs.

We are committed to help alleviate the plight of captive peoples such as the Bulgarians. President John F. Kennedy recalled this commitment to the countries of Eastern Europe when he addressed himself to the people of free Europe at Frankfurt, Germany, on June 25, 1963. He said:

All of us in the West must be faithful to our conviction that peace in Europe can never be complete until everywhere in Europe . . . men can choose in peace and freedom how their countries shall be governed.

Let us pay tribute to Nikola Petkov and to the liberty-loving heroes of other oppressed nations who have worked, fought, and died for the basic human right of self-government. May their example be an inspiration to men everywhere when the path of freedom is difficult, as it is today in Vietnam. May we also always remember our traditional, abiding commitment to the principles of liberty and human dignity and to the peoples who struggle to achieve them.

The New Immigration Reform Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1965

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to have the opportunity to join in commending the distinguished chairman of our Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], for the fine presentation he has made in summarizing provisions of the newly enacted immigration reform bill. In this question and answer form, our colleague's summary will provide most useful information for the citizens who are immediately concerned about effects of the new law. The gentleman from Ohio certainly deserves our thanks for making available to us so expeditiously this practical and concise guide to our new immigration policies. I am sure many Members of Congress, as I, have already received urgent inquiries

from citizens who have been waiting long years for reunion with relatives in countries with heavily oversubscribed quotas. This summary for the layman, together with the detailed analysis being prepared by the Judiciary Committee, will be invaluable to all Members in informing and assisting the many people throughout the Nation who can now look forward to having their families united in America.

Wise Words by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Record, I would like to include some very inspiring words by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, beloved Chaplain of the U.S. Senate. The following article, "Yesterday's Sour Grapes Don't Explain You," should be carefully read by every American in these critical days when so many are eager to shed individual responsibility by blaming all our shortcomings on the past.

Dr. Harris' article appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of October 3, 1965:

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT: "YESTERDAY'S SOUR GRAPES DON'T EXPLAIN YOU"

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, U.S. Senate)

More than 2,500 years before the date of this column, the public-spirited prophet, Ezekiel, was probing for the cause of the debauchery of the day. The question was: Why does this wild generation act the way they do—commit the excesses of which they are guilty? There was a breakdown of moral standards, sex perversion was rampant, business was honeycombed with dishonesty and doubledealing. There was complacent indifference to the welfare of the underprivileged. Honor, once bright, was now dimmed.

All this is mirrored in the Biblical record of this day of so long ago, which seems almost to match the headlines of the 20th-century days. To the prophet's insistence that there was no excuse for those who were guilty of betraying the high ethical ideals which were a part of the national heritage, the young generation, running wild, cried out to this preacher of old-fashioned righteousness, "Don't blame us. The fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth have been set on edge." To which sophistry Ezekiel thundered, "Don't undertake to explain your lapses by quoting that old cliché, and claiming that a former generation is to blame for putting something into your life, or by withholding something from it. Yesterday's sour grapes do not explain you. Heredity and environment are not the chief factors of your destiny."

Centuries after the prophet's scornful rejection of the sour grape theory to explain today's debauchery, Jesus told the story of the good Samaritan. There seems to be a new version of that matchless story for the days we now face. To some modern psychiatrists the chief thing in that narrative is not the victim, wounded, robbed, and left by the highwaymen by the roadside to die. It

Also, S. 2294, extension of the Wheat Agreement Act, open rule, 1 hour of debate; and House Resolution 602, dismissing the contested election in the Third Congressional District of Iowa, Peterson against Gross.

On Tuesday and Wednesday we have H.R. 11135, Sugar Act Amendments of 1965. This will come to the House under a closed rule, waiving points of order, but making in order the offering of two amendments by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY], with 4 hours of general debate.

H.R. 10065, the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1965, which comes with an open rule and 2 hours of general debate.

On Thursday there are eight unanimous-consent bills of the Committee on Ways and Means, and they are as follows:

H.R. 327, exempting from taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations operated to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations;

H.R. 7723, suspension of duty, certain tropical hardwoods;

H.R. 8210, amending the International Organizations Immunities Act;

H.R. 8436, dutiable status of watches, clocks, and so forth, from insular possessions of the United States;

H.R. 8445, retired pay, Tax Court judges;

H.R. 11216, tariff treatment of articles assembled abroad;

H.R. 10625, tax treatment of certain amounts paid to certain members and former members of uniformed services and to their survivors; and

H.R. 6319, tax treatment of expropriation loss recoveries.

For Friday and the balance of the week, the supplemental appropriation bill for 1966.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to advise the House that the leadership will request the indulgence of Members that we may have flexibility in rearranging the program during next week, as it is obvious that we are trying to finish the business of the House. We shall try to keep Members advised from day to day of any changes in or additions to the program.

May I advise further that there are 2 days when we expect not to have any rollcall votes except on procedural matters. One is Tuesday, when we will have only general debate on the sugar bill, and Thursday, when several bills will be brought up under unanimous consent.

This announcement is made, of course, subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit me to ask a question at this point?

Mr. ALBERT. Of course.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. If we follow this schedule, the Sugar Act amendments will be brought up and the rule will be passed and the debate concluded on Tuesday, and then we shall go over and finish that bill on Wednesday; and subsequent to that take up the Equal Employment Opportunity Act?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct. Wednesday, of course, is a very heavy day. We expect to finish the work on the sugar bill and to handle the Equal Employment Opportunity Act.

COMMITTEE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia have until midnight October 9 to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER UNTIL MONDAY, OCTOBER 11

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, would the distinguished minority leader yield in order that I may propound a question to the distinguished majority leader?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I wonder what would be the basis for not having any votes other than on procedural matters on two of the days, what those days will be, and so forth.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished gentleman from Michigan will yield further, I am glad the gentleman from Missouri has brought that matter up.

Tuesday is Columbus Day. It is a day in which some Members of the House have a particular interest and, of course, all Members of the House are vitally interested in that day.

Thursday is President Eisenhower's birthday and I believe there are some Members of the House who will have an interest in that day. I know I for one do.

In the spirit of the great bipartisan harmony which was displayed last night, we will all want to salute the great former President of the United States.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished minority leader will yield further, I would hope that the distinguished majority leader's prediction will be closer to coming true than his very erudite assumption when I finally withdrew my

reservation of objection about coming in yesterday morning at 11 o'clock, wherein he stated that the intention was to complete the bill on Friday. I had no idea that there was to be a continuous session, but in fact that prediction was correct and we did finish it on Friday.

I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding.

IMMIGRATION ACT

(Mr. EDWARDS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the immigration reform bill the President signed into law at the base of the Statue of Liberty is an historic piece of legislation welding this Nation to its historic ideals of equality and justice.

The action of the Congress and the President in bringing this measure into force is significant for reasons both symbolic and practical. We are moving to strike away harmful racial and ethnic boundaries in our society. The new law is a step toward that goal, for it replaces a law that for two decades has violated the principles on which America was founded and grew strong.

The 40-year-old national origins system we have replaced had little support either in logic or in principle, and it demeaned our Nation. In allocating quotas according to the supposed national origins of the American population of 1920, it favored immigrants from the countries of northern Europe and discriminated against those from everywhere else.

The quota for Ireland, for example, was larger than that for all of Asia. The quota for Switzerland was larger than for all the nations of Africa. Because of discrepancies such as this, quotas assigned northern European countries often remained unfilled, while other countries had long waiting lists.

The implications of the national origins quota system remained undisguised—it openly suggested that one kind of ancestry is better than another, that a person from England is nine times more acceptable than one from Poland or 12 times more acceptable than one from Italy.

This is an implication which was rejected by four American Presidents before Lyndon B. Johnson—from President Woodrow Wilson who vetoed the first bill to John Kennedy. It is an implication which America has finally put to rest.

In so doing we have asserted anew our confidence in the strength of our traditions of equality—traditions that are inseparable from the very origins of our country. Indeed, not only did the Declaration of Independence affirm that "all men are created equal," some of the very grievances that caused it to be written were the restrictions imposed on immigration to the Colonies by the British Crown.

From the very beginning America was thrown open to all equally. Thomas Jefferson spoke for his countrymen when he asked "Shall we refuse to the unhappy fugitives from distress that hos-

pitality which the savages of the wilderness extended to our fathers arriving in this land? Shall oppressed humanity find no asylum on this globe?"

Oppressed humanity did find asylum in the New World. The settlers of our land came from many countries, so that America was formed both by the unity of their uprooting and the diversity of their cultures.

The diversity and unity are still reflected in our society today. We are now an amalgam, a people different from any other. At the same time, we are proud of the diversity within our country that reflects the many nations from which we came.

Men and women of every ethnic background have added to the culture and achievements of our land. Their contribution is not only a thing of the past—it is before us every day. Many of them, and their parents and their grandparents, might not have been able to emigrate here had the national origins quota system been in effect at the time of their migration.

The legislation we have enacted is simple and fair. It retains a limit on total immigration not substantially higher than present limits. But rather than imposing arbitrary limits based on national origin, it chooses among potential immigrants on the basis of their relationship to persons already living in the United States and on the basis of the skills they can bring here. We are now asking those who would come here, "What can you do and what can you contribute?"—not "Where were you born?" The new act preserves health and security safeguards but gives immigrants a preference by their skill, attainments, and training, or by family relationships, and not by ancestry or residence.

This act will, first of all, strengthen the United States domestically. We advance as we allow entrance to men and women who have special skills we need badly. Their talents will help to fill shortages in vital professional fields.

Second, this act will strengthen the United States in its foreign relations. Secretary of State Rusk has pointed out how the discriminatory features of our immigration laws damaged our conduct of foreign policy.

With the signing of this act the sincerity of our belief in the equality of men is no longer open to question.

What we have done also strengthens the morality of our position toward ourselves. We do not ask the men who are fighting in Vietnam what their national origins are before sending them there. We do not ask them whether their names are English or Irish or Italian or Japanese before sending them into action. We do not ask them in what year their ancestors came to America.

This Immigration Act merges our deeds with our faith. By adopting it we have acknowledged that people of every national background and racial origin have built America. And we have made clear our belief that people of every national background and racial origin will continue to contribute to America.

CERTAIN REMARKS MADE BY MR. DOLE, OF KANSAS

(Mr. HOWARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I hope no Member of this House will make any disparaging remarks today about the wife of Representative DOLE, of Kansas, in retaliation for his despicable action on the floor last evening in reference to the First Lady of our land, Mrs. Johnson. I feel strongly that Mrs. Dole, as well as the wives of all men in public service, should be especially commended and honored for the added burdens placed upon them so that their husbands may be privileged to be in public service. I know I owe a great debt of gratitude to my wife, one which I will never be able to completely repay.

It was unfortunate to say the very least that the gentleman from Kansas should have maligned our First Lady in this way at the very moment she was accompanying her husband, our President, to the hospital where he was to undergo major surgery. There is a phrase from a popular song of a few years ago which asked "how low can you go?" I believe that last night the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] showed us how to hit rock-bottom.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Not, of course, speaking for the gentleman from Kansas, my very dear and longtime friend, Congressman DOLE, but only speaking for myself I feel the gentleman from New Jersey misinterpreted the motion of the gentleman from Kansas last night. I hope the gentleman will mature and enlarge his sense of humor so that he will be able to take these things as they come without attributing to Members of the House like BOB DOLE ulterior motives and base personal attitudes and intentions. I can assure the gentleman, based on my longtime personal friendship with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], that he neither intended or said anything base or personal.

Mr. HOWARD. I think we might better narrow our sense of humor if enlarging it amounts to including statements like that about our First Lady.

THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

(Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time to challenge the correctness of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in an attempt to find out who assumes the authority to expunge from the Record proceedings which occur on the floor of the House.

During the proceedings last night following the adoption of the motion made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], wherein debate on title I and all amendments thereto was to close

at 8:20 p.m., the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole stated he observed certain Members on their feet desiring to be recognized; and after reading the names from a list, announced that each of those Members would be recognized for 10 seconds.

This statement was expunged from the Record.

Mr. Speaker, the charge I am making in regard to the failure of the Record to reflect what happened in this particular instance is of little importance, but the principle of permitting the Record to be changed is a serious matter.

During this session particularly, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is being thrown together not only in a sloppy manner but I maintain it has ceased to be an official record of what actually transpires on the floor of the House but rather has become a misrepresentation of what actually occurs. I believe the public is entitled to know that they cannot read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with any assurance that it is an accurate record of the proceedings of this House.

RESPECT FOR OUR FIRST LADY

(Mr. KREBS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the statement by my colleague from New Jersey to this group a few minutes ago and ask that I be affiliated with and associated with those remarks in the Record.

HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION

(Mr. McCLORY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, my vote in opposition to the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, S. 2084, was a vote of protest against the dictatorial tactics of this administration in the presentation and consideration of this measure.

Indeed, my sentiments favor the enactment of this legislation and I agree with the major provisions of the bill. However, support of an idea or of a type of legislation should never require the U.S. Congress to renounce its legislative responsibilities. The atmosphere in which this measure was considered was one of pressure and strong will.

As I listened attentively to the early debates on this measure during the afternoon, I was of the impression that the consideration of amendments and final votes on the measure would be deferred until the following day. Indeed, the legislative activity of the week had been so meager that there appeared to be no valid reason for a night session in order to jam this bill through.

In the course of the late afternoon, it appeared that a change of tactics had developed on the Democratic side of the aisle requiring a completion of action on the bill before the Congress could adjourn yesterday. The President and Mrs. Johnson had invited the Members of Congress and their wives to attend a reception at the White House commencing

In the struggle for freedom and against enslavement, we are convinced that if we intensify our efforts final victory will be ours. We earnestly hope that all freedom-loving peoples in Asia, Africa, Australia, and other parts of the world will work together more closely for the aims and purposes we have set forth in this declaration.

Delegates to this 11th conference of the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League are from: Australia, Ceylon, Republic of China, Hongkong, India, Iran, Japan, Jordan, Ruykyus, Kenya, Korea, Laos, Liberia, Macao, Pakistan, Philippines, Somalia, Thailand, Turkey, Vietnam, and observers from Continental Research Institute, Congo (Leopoldville), Italy, Lebanon, Malta, Spain, Sweden, All-American Conference to Combat Communism, American Afro-Asian Educational Exchange (USA), Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN), Assembly of Captive European Nations, Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations (U.N.), Free Pacific Association, International Conference on Political Warfare Activity (CLAS), International Conference on Political Warfare of the Soviets (OIGP), Union of Russian Solidarity (URS), Malagasy Republic, United States, Saudi Arabia, Korean Freedom Board, Federation Argentina De Entidades Democraticas, National Captive Nation Committee, and Cuba.

Finally we wish to express our heartfelt thanks to the Philippine Government and people and the Philippine chapter of this league for their warm reception and hospitality. Also we wish to express our sincere admiration and respect to President Diosdado Macapagal for his leadership of the Philippine people in their struggle against communism and for the cause of democracy and freedom.

[From Free Front, July 7, 1965]

THE CRY OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

(By Dr. Jose Ma. Hernandez)

From behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains cries and whimpers of millions of people bleeding beneath the iron heel of the Communist hordes come floating in the very air we breathe.

We enjoy the air of unsullied freedom and in the free society still untainted by Communist doctrine and practice. We are able to give impetus and encouragement to our institutions of learning and to the arts and sciences of civilized mankind.

Only in the free air of peace and justice may we hope to progress on the road to ultimate happiness.

But the enslaved under the hammer and sickle are completely denied the basic freedoms guaranteed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The captive peoples under communism do not have either freedom of movement or even freedom of choice.

They cannot have even a square meter of land which they may call their own.

They are not allowed to possess personal property, for the Communist overlords are allergic to the institution of private property.

Everything must be collectivized. They cannot speak their minds for communism enforces thought control and complete suppression of speech, press, and freedom.

They cannot have a decent family life for the family and the human person are nothing; the State is everything.

They are oppressed and are complete victims of hunger and disease.

There are only relatively few dyed-in-the-wood, hardened Communists.

But they control one-third of the population of the world.

Wherever the Communists have established themselves with the instruments of

violence and bloodshed to cower and bulldoze hapless and helpless millions of men, women, and children, the light of freedom, love, and happiness has been snuffed out.

Every man is entitled to the gifts of freedom.

Therefore, we who are still in the free world must usher our brethren who are captives of the minions of communism into our free society.

It is our duty to uplift the downtrodden and break the chains of communism.

We must meet fire with fire.

If the Communists claim that they are a dedicated group, let us show them that we also are dedicated men.

But we do not believe in Communist imperialism, and we do not subscribe to violence, tyranny, and bloodshed.

We do not believe in the corruption of the youth by means of narcotics, sex, and vice.

The youth who will take over the reins of government for us must fight to free the captive peoples.

There are not two ways about it.

Either you are a freeman or a slave.

Choose.

To our minds there is no logical choice except freedom.

Freedom is the essence of true civilization.

Communism is a return to savagery.

So all freemen must unite to liberate the captive peoples of communism.

(Mr. HORTON (at the request of Mr. GROVER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. HORTON'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. GROVER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. FINDLEY'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

ARMY GOING SOFT

(Mr. CALLAWAY (at the request of Mr. GROVER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, about a month ago, 18,000 troops of the newly formed 1st Air Cavalry Division left Fort Benning, Ga., to take up the fight against communism in Vietnam. These men left behind home, family, and friends and followed their orders to their difficult but necessary task—that is, all but one. Back in Fort Benning there remained one soldier who had gone on a self-imposed hunger strike protesting his assignment to Vietnam on the grounds that he disagreed with our policy there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the troops have arrived in Vietnam, and perhaps by now have heard the whole story of what happened to the boy they left behind. They perhaps learned that their comrade began to eat again after they left, and that a court martial sentenced him to a 5-year prison term for evading Vietnam duty, yet the Army agreed to reduce his sentence to a suspended 1-year term.

Mr. Speaker, for their morale, for our country, and for the free world's cause, this is indeed one of the most regrettable incidents that I have ever encountered.

EXPLANATION IN QUESTION AND ANSWER FORM OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE IMMIGRATION ACT OF OCTOBER 3, 1965

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality which formulated the basic provisions of the new immigration bill signed into law by President Johnson on October 3, 1965, I have prepared 25 questions couched in the nontechnical language of the man in the street who wishes to know more about this law. They are the questions which are being asked and will be asked particularly by those with relatives and friends abroad whom they wish to help come to the United States.

My 25 answers highlight the main provisions of the law and outline the general procedures to be followed in making its provisions operative. It is my hope that this simple guide may save considerable time and no little expense for the interested many who have a need for this information.

The questions and answers follow:

Question 1. Is the immigration bill which the President signed on October 3, 1965, a general overhaul of the immigration and citizenship laws of the United States?

Answer. No: as the reports of the committees of the House and Senate make clear, the new law is not intended to be a general overhaul of the immigration law. Its principal purpose is to change the basis for selection of immigrants.

Question 2. What has been the basis for selection prior to the new law?

Answer. Each country of the world outside the Western Hemisphere has been assigned a fixed ceiling on the number of immigrants born in that country who could migrate to the United States annually. This system, in effect since 1924, ranges from a high of 85,861 for natives of Great Britain to a minimum of 100 which are authorized for each of about 80 separate areas. The total number authorized under this "National Origins Quota System" is currently 188,661. The average annual immigration under this system in the past decade has been 96,221, the balance of the numbers not being used because of the comparatively low demand from countries with the highest quotas.

Question 3. How many immigrants are authorized annually under the new system?

Answer. Two new ceilings are established. A limit of 170,000 will be set on immigrants who are natives of countries outside the Western Hemisphere. A ceiling of 120,000 will be placed on natives of the Western Hemisphere.

Question 4. Will these numbers be allocated by country?

Answer. No. Within each of the respective ceilings, selection will be made without regard to an applicant's birthplace or nationality. Outside the Western Hemisphere, allocations will be based on a system of preferences established by the new law. To insure that no country receives a dispro-

October 7, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

25431

portionate share, a limitation of 20,000 has been placed on natives of any one country. Within the Western Hemisphere allocations will be made on a "first-come first-served" basis with no limitations on the number from any one country.

Question 5. Since more than 170,000 persons will be applying to come to the United States each year, how will they be selected?

Answer. The new law establishes a system of preferences: 74 percent (125,800) will be reserved for relatives of U.S. citizens and resident aliens, in varying degrees; 20 percent (34,000) will be assigned to persons with skills and talents needed in the United States; 6 percent (10,200) will be made available to refugees.

Question 6. What are the degrees of relationship and specific percentages authorized for each class of relatives?

Answer. The unmarried sons and daughters of citizens over 21 years of age are allocated 20 percent.

The spouses and unmarried sons and daughters of aliens already here as immigrants are allocated 20 percent.

Married sons and daughters of citizens are allocated the next 10 percent of the relative class.

Brothers and sisters of citizens are given a 24-percent allocation.

Question 7. How are the preferences for "skills and talents" defined in the new law.

Answer. A preference of 10 percent is given to prospective immigrants who are members of the professions or who possess exceptional ability in the sciences or the arts. An additional 10 percent is allocated to persons who are capable of performing skilled or unskilled labor of a type found by the Secretary of Labor to be in short supply in the United States.

Question 8. Will all immigration to the United States be within the ceilings mentioned or will there be certain immigrants who are not counted?

Answer. Husbands, wives, unmarried children under the age of 21, and parents of U.S. citizens, are exempted from the numerical ceilings. This provision is in line with the general philosophy of the act that no obstacles be placed in the way of the reunification of the immediate families of the U.S. citizens, who otherwise meet the qualitative tests of the law.

Question 9. What steps must an alien who seeks to migrate to the United States do to accomplish this purpose?

Answer. He must register his intention with a U.S. consulate in the foreign country in which he is located and will thereafter, when a visa becomes available to him, under the particular class to which he is entitled and in accordance with the first-come first-served principle of the law, be invited by the consul to make a formal application for a visa. At that time he will be given a complete medical examination and be required to establish his mental and moral qualifications for immigration.

Question 10. Is an alien automatically entitled to apply for a visa by establishing to an American consul abroad that he has the relationship or the skills described in the law?

Answer. No. A petition must be filed with the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice by the citizen or resident alien relative who is sponsoring the alien applicant or by his prospective employer. Only after this petition is approved by the Immigration and Naturalization Service is the consul empowered to consider a visa application under the preference status which has been authorized.

Question 11. What documents must the sponsoring citizen or resident alien submit with his petition?

Answer. If the petitioner is a native born citizen he must submit a certified copy of his civil birth record. If he is a naturalized

citizen or is a resident alien, the Immigration and Naturalization Service will verify from its records his statements. Additionally the petitioner must submit the various birth, marriage, death or divorce certificates described in detail on the reverse of the petition form to establish the actual relationship between him and the alien applicant for preference classification.

Question 12. What documents must a prospective employer or other sponsor of skilled aliens submit with his petition?

Answer. The petition must describe in detail the work to be performed by the prospective immigrant, including the salary, wage or other remuneration to be received and must be supported by documents (as described on the reverse of the petition issued by the Department of Labor) attesting to the unavailability of unemployed persons capable of performing the tasks outlined in the petition.

Question 13. What are the refugee provisions of the law?

Answer. The law provides that 6 percent (10,200) of the 170,000 annual limitation shall be available for aliens defined as fugitives from communism or from the Middle East or persons displaced by natural calamities. Such persons will enter the United States conditionally for a period of 2 years at the end of which time, if their conduct and a review of their past history warrants, they will be given permanent residence rights.

Question 14. Since the refugees are a preference class in law must a petition be filed for their admission?

Answer. No. Refugees will be processed abroad by the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the countries where they have been granted temporary haven. Assurances for their housing, employment and follow up services will be provided by American voluntary agencies, as in the past.

Question 15. Will aliens who cannot qualify for one of the preferences be eligible for admission as immigrants?

Answer. Yes. Such authorized immigrant visas as are not required to satisfy the demands of the preference classes can be made available to other applicants for admission, strictly in the order in which they are registered on the lists of qualified applicants maintained by the Department of State.

Question 16. Have the qualitative tests for admission been relaxed in any way? May subversives, criminals, drug peddlers and immoral persons against whom strict safeguards have been written into the law in the past, now be admitted?

Answer. No. None of the provisions of the law relating to the bars against the admission of these undesirables have been changed in any way.

Question 17. Have any new qualitative controls been added to the law?

Answer. Yes. New labor controls have been added to the law to protect American workers and their standards of employment.

Question 18. How will these new labor controls be applied?

Answer. The Secretary of Labor is required, in the case of all worker immigrant classes, to make an affirmative finding that there are no willing and able American workers to fill the particular employment opportunity the immigrant is scheduled to take upon his admission to the United States. The Secretary of Labor is also required to certify that the employment of such alien workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers similarly employed in the United States.

Question 19. Who are regarded as worker immigrants under the law?

Answer. All aliens who apply for admission as immigrants from countries outside the Western Hemisphere and who do not qualify under one of the relative preferences

or as a refugee are regarded as worker immigrants. Similarly, all aliens who apply for admission as immigrants from the independent republics of the Western Hemisphere except parents, spouses, and children of U.S. citizens and permanent resident aliens, are regarded as worker immigrants.

Question 20. Are there any provisions to take care of persons who are already in the United States but do not have the right to reside here permanently?

Answer. Yes, there are three such provisions in the law, they are called "Registry," "Adjustment of Status," and "Suspension of Deportation."

Question 21. What does "Registry" mean?

Answer. Registry authorizes the Immigration and Naturalization Service to create a record of an alien's lawful admission for permanent residence regardless of the manner of his actual entry or the place of his birth provided he has resided in the United States since June 30, 1948, is a person of good moral character and is not subject to deportation because of criminality or immorality.

Question 22. What is "Adjustment of Status?"

Answer. This provision permits aliens in the United States, other than natives of the Western Hemisphere or crewmen, to have their status adjusted to that of permanent resident alien. It benefits only those aliens, who, if abroad would be eligible for immediate issuance of an immigrant visa. The purpose of this provision is to save the very heavy expense which would be involved if such alien was obliged to return to his homeland to obtain the visa to which he is otherwise completely entitled.

Question 23. What is "Suspension of Deportation" and to whom does it apply?

Answer. Suspension of deportation is available to an alien who has been ordered deported from the United States but whose deportation would result in an extreme hardship to him or to his spouse or child. To be eligible the alien must have resided in the United States for at least 7 years (in some few cases 10 years). Natives of Canada, Mexico, and the Caribbean Islands generally are ineligible for this privilege as are aliens who entered the United States temporarily under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act. As the term indicates, the deportation of an alien under this provision is suspended for a period of 2 years, during which time the Congress has an opportunity to review the case and if Congress does not object, the alien is permitted to become a permanent resident.

Question 24. Are the three benefits which are available to aliens temporarily in the United States granted as a matter of a right which they possess?

Answer. No. These three benefits are not granted as a "right" but are authorized only in the discretion of the Immigration and Naturalization Service acting for the Attorney General, to deserving persons. The law provides that, unless the alien is born in the Western Hemisphere, persons who acquire the status of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence are counted within the annual ceilings on immigrants to the same extent as though he had been issued an immigrant visa abroad by an American consul.

Question 25. Will the abolition of the national origins quota system take effect immediately?

Answer. No. The system provided under the new law will not become completely effective until July 1, 1968. However, during the interval, the new law permits the average of 50,000 quota visas which now go unused each year to be redistributed among countries which do not currently have enough quota numbers to satisfy the relative and skilled classes who were born in such countries. The purpose of this 3-year transition period is to reunite families as soon as

possible and to start the new system with all countries on an equal footing.

(Mr. CHELF (at the request of Mr. FEIGHAN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished and hard working chairman of our subcommittee for his efforts to get the straight message of our subcommittee immigration bill to all the people. The answers he has prepared to a series of practical questions are the meat of the new immigration law. In down to earth language our chairman explains what the bill will do and what it will not do.

It really takes know-how to reduce a complicated and technical matter such as this to language that everyone can understand. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] most certainly has the necessary know-how which he demonstrated as chairman of our subcommittee and as advocate of the immigration bill produced by our subcommittee. People want to know what the new law is all about and they have a right to know. I compliment our chairman for his efforts to keep the people informed about the new selective system of immigrant admissions and for explaining in simple, plain, understandable language how the system will work.

Our subcommittee held open hearings on this most important legislation for over 3½ years. This year our chairman [Mr. FEIGHAN] literally worked our subcommittee like he was old "Simon Legree." We met day after day—week after week, and month after month until we had completed our most difficult assignment. It is a fair bill, a reasonable one, and I salute our chairman for his magnificent contribution. This "question and answer" data is concrete proof of his knowledge of the subject matter.

(Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. FEIGHAN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

[Mr. RODINO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. DONOHUE (at the request of Mr. FEIGHAN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, the long-desired and imperatively urgent immigration bill recently approved by the Congress has now, by Presidential signature, become historic Public Law 236 of the 89th Congress.

Its principal features provide for the abolishment of the discriminatory 41-year-old national origins quota system of admission to the United States and preference classification to applicants with close family ties to U.S. citizens and those possessing skills essentially needed in this country.

This law will have, of course, a tremendous impact upon the lives of untold numbers of individuals and families, both here in this country and abroad. Although the language of the law may be clear, to those of us with legislative experience it will undoubtedly seem quite complex, and be subject to possible misinterpretation by a great many

inexperienced but vitally interested and affected persons and organizations.

On this score, the dedicated and esteemed chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, has most timely and thoughtfully prepared and presented, for the enlightenment of all these people and units, a very clear and comprehensive explanation, by a question and answer series, of the meaning and application of the provisions of the law. Undoubtedly, his presentation will be of immeasurable assistance to even Members of Congress in providing answers to questions about the bill that they will surely receive from constituents.

Mr. Speaker, for the great sacrifice of time and energy in preparing this document that was made by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, of which I am privileged to be a member, and for his characteristic thoroughness, both personal and official, I desire to join with my colleagues in congratulating him for this further and most significant contribution to the better understanding of one of the most important legislative actions of the Congress in modern history. For this particular achievement and his recognized patriotic dedication to legislative progress Congressman MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN eminently merits the sincere appreciation and gratitude of the Congress and the country.

(Mr. BROOKS (at the request of Mr. FEIGHAN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Immigration Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, I want to congratulate our distinguished colleague from Ohio, Congressman MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, who has rendered this body outstanding service as chairman of the subcommittee. He has worked long and hard to perfect the recently passed immigration bill, a monumental undertaking, signed into law by President Lyndon B. Johnson, in the shadow of the Statue of Liberty. With his leadership Congress was able to write into law new and meaningful legislation which enables our immigration policies to meet today's needs and those of the foreseeable future.

The explanation of the new immigration law that the distinguished gentleman has just introduced is an example of his thoughtfulness. It will enable all of the Members of this body to better understand the law and also enable us to explain it more completely to our constituencies. For this thoughtful service we are even further indebted to our respected colleague, MIKE FEIGHAN.

(Mr. GILBERT (at the request of Mr. FEIGHAN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment Chairman FEIGHAN of the Immigration Subcommittee. As a member of the subcommittee, I know how diligently he worked on the immigration bill. His vast knowledge in the field of immigration contributed immeasurably to the drafting of a just and fair bill—a bill which signifies to the world that we

continue to stand for the great principles of human freedom and equality on which our Nation was founded.

I have read the 25 questions prepared by Chairman FEIGHAN and his answers, which explain the provisions of the bill in layman's language. These are questions which would be asked by the man in the street, and his replies are in concise and nontechnical language.

Again, I want to commend the chairman of my subcommittee and thank him for his efforts in providing this information which will be of interest and value to anyone who wishes to be fully informed on the provisions of the new immigration bill.

(Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. FEIGHAN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] in the construction of certain questions and answers with respect to immigration changes and commend him for inserting them into the Record. These are unique questions and answers concerning the new immigration reform bill. This information covers only the major aspects of Public Law 89-236; however, many of the public misunderstandings concerning the new law should be cleared up by this presentation.

Some rather wild, unfounded and far-fetched statements have been made with respect to the probable consequences and effects of Public Law 89-236 upon our immigration policy. Careful examination of the legislation will reveal that it strengthens our immigration system and furnishes additional guarantees that the interests of the United States will have first and foremost consideration.

An analysis and simple explanation of the new law, providing more detail than the questions and answers provided by the gentleman from Ohio, is being prepared by the Judiciary Committee. Members may well want to obtain copies of this information.

(Mr. CAHILL (at the request of Mr. FEIGHAN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, the immigration bill has been signed by the President and is now the law of the land.

Because this recently passed legislation changes substantially our law on immigration, it will naturally pose many questions to those interested in matters pertaining to immigration and nationality. As always there will be some misunderstanding as to what the law does and does not do. As always, provisions of the bill will be susceptible of various interpretations. As always, citizens will want to know: How do I do it? Where do I do it? To whom do I write for information?

Many questions will be asked of all Members of this House by interested constituents. I am, therefore, pleased to commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality for his thoughtfulness in preparing a series of questions, with accompanying answers, on matters of great importance which are covered by the recently passed legislation. I am sure the answers supplied to the questions propounded will

be helpful to all of our citizens in understanding the important features of the immigration bill.

(Mr. MacGREGOR (at the request of Mr. FEIGHAN), was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

[Mr. MacGREGOR'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

GROWING THREAT OF MAIL FRAUDS CHALLENGED BY ALERT POSTAL OFFICIALS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the number of mail fraud cases in the United States in the last few years has risen approximately 43 percent, making this subject of interest to every American citizen.

To convey some idea of the magnitude to which this issue has grown, the Inspection Service of the U.S. Post Office Department has divided such frauds into 67 major categories. These include advance fees for the sale of small businesses, real estate, and obtaining of loans; knitting and sewing machine promotions; "work at home" operations promising victims profitable employment in the home, addressing envelopes, and so forth; correspondence schools and diploma mills; fraudulent interstate land subdivision sales; medical frauds; matrimonial schemes; savings and loan swindles, such as occurred in Maryland; and a host of other merchandising and confidence swindles. Although this is by no means a blanket indictment of all concerns within the above-mentioned categories, still the abuses of some of the unscrupulous make a word of warning advisable.

Fraudulent promotions vary in scope and variety from the obvious quick-profit gimmicks to complex multi-million-dollar schemes not easily recognized by the average citizen. Because of the increasing adverse effects on the general public, a number of special investigative programs which bear directly on consumer interests have been instituted within the Postal Inspection Service. Typical of these are the investigations of the mortgage loan rackets which are preying upon persons in need of ready cash. Preliminary studies indicate the operation of a nationwide scheme fleecing consumers by charging exorbitant fees for loans to reduce their current monthly payments on outstanding indebtedness. In one instance such a loan in the sum of \$3,000 left the victim with a second mortgage of \$6,856.

The October issue of the Reader's Digest contains an instructive article on the scourge of mail frauds and the indispensable role played by the Inspection Service to counteract them. In addition, the Post Office Appropriations hearings in the House earlier this year provide useful information on this issue. In the hope that advance warning will dictate a prudent course of action regarding these vicious schemes, I ask that the

Reader's Digest article, "Meet the Men Who Guard Your Mail," and excerpts from the Post Office Appropriations hearings for 1966 be included at this point:

[From the Reader's Digest, Oct. 1965]

MEET THE MEN WHO GUARD YOUR MAIL

(Invisible to the lawabiding, the fabulously efficient U.S. postal inspectors are anathema to crooks and racketeers.)

(By Frederic Sonder, Jr.)

Late every afternoon in Washington a small group of unusual law-enforcement officers gathers for a conference in the office of Chief Inspector Henry B. Montague, head of the Inspection Service of the U.S. Post Office Department. These men are the top executives of a select, almost anonymous police force of 1,028 men across the country—the postal inspectors—who in fiscal 1965 stood guard over more than 70 billion pieces of our mail and \$20 billion of our money.

The scope and complexity of the inspectors' formidable job have increased rapidly during the last few years. Since 1961, pilfering of checks and other valuables from mailboxes has shot up 17 percent. Swindles promoted through the mails have burgeoned at the rate of 43 percent, and arrests for mail-order pornography have increased 91 percent.

"We do our best," says Chief Montague.

Their best is good, as was demonstrated last year by the speed with which the inspectors arrested 12,790 crooks (many of them prime movers in their rackets), convicted 11,129—99 percent of those brought to trial—suppressed 5,422 swindling operations and restored some \$14 million to victims of thievery and fraud. "But then," the chief says, "we have a formidable combine to help us. Our thousands of postmasters and their people, who particularly in smaller places have extraordinary knowledge of their patrons, are a far flung G-2. Also we get complete cooperation from several thousand police forces, Federal, State, and local."

An important reason for the service's remarkable connections with the Nation's police is the strict rule that the credit for solving a case goes to the cooperating force or forces, regardless of how important a role the inspectors may have played. The inspectors are also unusually openhanded with information to other law-enforcement bodies, which respond in kind. "We don't want credit," a service official told me. "We want results."

FEARSOME REPUTATION

A dramatic case which broke last year vividly illustrates these results. The Criminal Intelligence Division of the New York City Police Department had learned through its underworld informers that a gang was planning to rob the post office of the Roman Catholic Mission at Maryknoll, 30 miles north of New York City. This large center and training school sends missionaries all over the world. Its small post office, run by nuns, handles substantial sums of money—contributions to the Catholic Foreign Mission Society of America. Postal inspectors joined New York City detectives to keep a watch on the gang—a vigil which lasted 2 months. The inspectors also coordinated plans with the Westchester County sheriff, the State police, and the mission.

The four armed bandits, dressed as seminarians, who arrived at the little post office on a Monday morning in March didn't stand a chance. The clerk behind the counter in a nun's habit was a policewoman. The man in clerical robes supervising a truck outside was the county sheriff. Ten laborers nearby were deputies with guns under their jackets. In a building nearby was a command post directing 40 State troopers and 8 New York

City policemen hidden behind a strategic ring of bushes. All escape roads were blocked by police cruisers.

The robbers were allowed to proceed without interference. They ordered the pseudo-sister into a washroom, stuffed \$60,000 worth of currency, stamps, and negotiable money orders into a mailbag, and went happily to their car. At that point a bullhorn roared, "Come out and surrender"—and the battle started. It didn't last long. The bandits' car, riddled with bullets, plunged over an embankment into a tree. The men are now in prison.

The inspectors have a fearsome reputation in the underworld for just such productions as the Maryknoll case. This respect was demonstrated recently when a gang of skillful professional burglars was plundering supermarkets through Virginia and neighboring States, using a big trailer-truck to transport the loot. They happened to raid a store which had a sub-post office in a corner. Realizing the danger they had encountered, they carefully chalked a circle around the postal enclosure and wrote in big letters: "Inspector, we did not pass this line."

MANY FACES

The professionals call the inspectors "the Spooks" because of their many faces and unconventional methods. Many of them can play a variety of parts convincingly: a drunken bum, a bus driver, a janitor, a clergyman.

Not long ago it was discovered that valuable parcel post was being stolen on the rail run between Chicago and St. Paul. The parcels arrived at their destination in locked mail pouches, but they were empty. Investigation pinpointed the car which was being pilfered, but not the pilferers. The inspectors were stymied. There was no place inside the car for a man to hide, yet the thieves had to be caught opening the bags. Then one inspector had an idea. "I'll go in a coffin," he said, "as a corpse." And so he did, in a specially built one with concealed vents. Placed aboard the suspect car, he lay in the casket listening. Finally he heard three men talking and opening bags. Raising the lid of his coffin, he emerged gun in hand. The three thieves were so appalled by the apparition that they offered no resistance. They were two brakemen and an express messenger who had managed to steal a mail-pouch key. They opened the bags, took anything of value from the parcels, rewrapped the empties, and put them back into the pouches.

THIEVES IN YOUR MAILBOX

The city pilfering gangs who raid mailboxes are a problem but they are usually quickly broken up. The inspectors are continually on the prowl in unmarked cars and on foot in various disguises. The innocent-looking man who follows the mail carrier into an apartment building and, acting like a tenant, watches him deposit the mail is likely to have another innocent-looking man, an inspector, right behind him. A bigger problem for the inspectors is the lone pilferer who has no set pattern, no underworld connections. Many of these are narcotics addicts who steal to support the habit.

What worries and taxes the Service most of all, however, is the appalling rise in mail frauds. Last year almost 10,000 cases were investigated, and more than 900 of the most dangerous culprits were arrested. Chief Montague estimates that the public was bilked of at least \$100 million.

This abuse of the mails is now receiving concentrated attention from the inspectors. The Service has broken down the rackets into 67 major categories. Key inspectors specialize in the various fields. For example, inspectors with medical training hunt down quack "doctors" and salesmen of worthless medicines, therapeutic devices and do-it-yourself treatments.

Almost as vicious as the quacks who prey on physical worry are the peddlers of fake business opportunities who beam their sales pamphlets mainly at older people—retired, disabled, and with limited means—with promises of comfortable incomes from work-at-home schemes. Part-time occupations are offered in mail addressing, sewing, clipping newspapers, and in fraudulent “franchises” for vending machines, food operations, building services. The imagination of the swindlers seems to be limitless. One promoter made an estimated \$3 million in a few years by first selling a method of applying a velvetlike finish to any material, then switching to miniature trees, tropical fish, molding machines for making plastic novelties and other fraudulent enterprises. When convicted, he had become one of the largest and most complained about promoters in the United States.

A group of promoters in California not long ago sold nearly \$3 million of worthless building lots in the desert before one of the victims realized he could go to the postal inspectors. These promoters went to prison. Then there's the “song shark,” who poses as a legitimate music publisher, gets advance fees from hopeful amateur songwriters for “rewrite and publication.” One, recently jailed, collected at least a million dollars before the inspectors' combine closed in on him. Four bogus correspondence schools lured more than 4,000 victims into taking valueless courses which, it was implied, would lead to U.S. Civil Service positions.

ACCIDENT PRONE

But theft still presents the greatest challenge to the service's famous ingenuity. Recently valuable mail was disappearing from the basement of an eastern railroad station. The inspectors, in shifts, took position in a crate commanding a view of the entire floor and labeled: “Water cooler, type F, Item No. 358957.” One night the thieves struck a mail shipment made purposely attractive by the inspectors, and they were so happy over their loot that one of them decided to swipe the water cooler, too. He aimed his flashlight beam through a slot in the crate and recoiled violently, screaming, “There's a murdered guy in there!” The pilferers were ashen-faced when they were arrested shortly after. “We didn't kill the guy” they chanted. They were much relieved to learn that only a grand larceny charge would be brought against them.

Sometimes an inspector's ingenuity backfires. One of them, in charge of a substantial pilferage case in a large post office, found that the 4-foot-wide conveyor belt near the ceiling was his best vantage for observing the suspects. He was getting them redhanded from his perch when the belt suddenly began to move, gathering speed. To shout for help would have ruined his case; so, to avoid being sent down a chute with the mail sacks, he began running the treadmill, leaping and dodging the sacks to remain in position. Some 30 minutes later, utterly exhausted, he had his case.

“I guess we're accident prone in a peculiar kind of way,” laughed one supervisor. “We seem to get into some strange predicaments. But the boys don't complain.” This is true: the personnel turnover in the inspection service is almost nil.

GOOD LISTENERS

The inspectors are good listeners. If you think that you might be the victim of a mail fraud, write or telephone your nearest postal inspector. Your postmaster will know how you can reach him.

Some tips from the Postal Inspection Service:

1. Have a mailbox with a formidable lock. Gather up your mail as soon as possible after it has been delivered.

2. Report immediately to your postmaster if you feel that anything has been stolen from your box.

3. Check on the validity of any business offer with your bank, your lawyer, your local chamber of commerce or Better Business Bureau before you sign any contract or make any payment.

4. If you receive in the mail an offer that smells the least bit of fraud, take the documents—with the envelopes—to your postmaster immediately. It may save you and many other from being victimized.

[Excerpts From the Post Office Appropriations Hearings for 1966]

SOME REPRESENTATIVE MAIL FRAUD PROMOTIONS

CHAIN REFERRAL RACKET

A rapidly expanding scheme involving highly organized sales campaigns in the sale of everything from automobiles to vacuum cleaners systems by persuading prospective customers that they can earn the cost of the item, as well as extra money in the form of “sales commissions,” by referring salesmen to friends or relatives was found to be costing consumers millions of dollars annually. Our investigations during fiscal year 1964 led to the return of mail fraud indictments in 3 such cases against 14 persons, but we are only “scratching the surface.”

SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

A. Gordon Boone, member of the Maryland House of Delegates and self-suspended speaker of that body, was found guilty of mail fraud at Baltimore, Md., on March 5, 1964, in the operation of Security Financial Insurance Corp. of Maryland. He was sentenced to 3 years imprisonment and fined \$1,000. SFIC was organized in Maryland in 1959 to insure the accounts of savings and loan associations controlled by D. Spencer Grow, Provo, Utah, and C. Oran Mensik, Chicago, Ill., whose convictions were reported last year. Boone is the last of the major figures to be tried for mail fraud in the Maryland savings and loan investigations begun by postal inspectors in 1958.

REAL ESTATE PROMOTIONS

Our investigations of fraudulent land promotions are continuing. These promoters offer unsuitable, undeveloped land for sale in beautiful advertisements depicting very desirable locations. Among the 17 persons convicted for this offense during fiscal year 1964 was Calvin J. Van Stratum sentenced at Atlanta, Ga., to 5 years' imprisonment for operating land fraud schemes in Georgia and Vermont. He had obtained contracts in Georgia totaling \$300,000 and was starting operations in Vermont when an alert inspector arrested him. Van Stratum indicated that in another 2 weeks he would have realized an additional \$100,000.

WORK-AT-HOME PROMOTIONS

The conviction of Sidney Rosenblum, operator of National Plans Service, New York, N.Y., a “work at home” scheme is an example of such swindles. Rosenblum was sentenced to serve 18 months and fined \$12,000 for mail fraud. He was given an additional 5-year consecutive sentence, which was suspended with the provision that he not engage in any mail-order business. This scheme involved primarily promised profits for clipping newspaper items for which \$3 was charged for “instructions.” It is estimated that Rosenblum realized more than \$300,000 from this scheme. These are particularly vicious swindles since they appeal to persons who are ill or indigent or who for various reasons cannot obtain employment outside the home.

DANCE STUDIO

Possibly the most bizarre fraud cases currently under investigation are those relating to dance studios. These “studios” promise fame, fortune, and highly successful careers in the theater, television, and such media. Instances have been noted where victims,

principally elderly widows, have paid in excess of \$10,000 for lifetime dancing lessons. In this category is the case of Dale Dance Studios, St. Paul and Minneapolis, Minn., the promoters of which were convicted of mail fraud on January 31, 1964. They were charged with defrauding at least 12 women of up to \$10,000 each, in some instances most of their life savings.

MEDICAL FRAUDS

Medical frauds which induce the sick and aging to forgo proper diagnosis and treatment while attempting self-medication continue to be a source of grave concern. Increased attention to these cases resulted in the indictment during the year of 21 persons, 8 of whom have been convicted to date.

MERCHANDISE SWINDLES

The operations of so-called claim adjusters who advertise nationally purporting to offer “distress merchandise” at bargain prices have long been the cause of numerous complaints from postal patrons.

PLANNED BANKRUPTCIES

An upsurge in fraudulent bankruptcies has been noted during the year, and there is evidence that gangster elements have entered this lucrative field. A number of such cases are currently under investigation. The usual procedure is to acquire control of a reputable business with a good credit rating and promptly deluge suppliers with orders for large quantities of merchandise of every description. This is immediately disposed of at whatever the market will bring. When the duped creditors demand payment resort is had to voluntary bankruptcy.

SUGAR LOBBYISTS DO NOT BENEFIT THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, amendments I will offer to the proposed revision and 5-year extension of the Sugar Act, when it reaches the House floor, will transfer to the U.S. Treasury 75 percent of the excess profit in foreign quotas and, in effect, outlaw nondiplomatic representation of foreign governments in regard to sugar legislation.

Powerful forces are being brought to bear in opposition to my amendments. Almost every hour brings some new indication. Therefore, I seek by this means to help clarify the facts.

Some of my colleagues have asked why I propose to single out lobbyists who represent foreign sugar interests. The answer is simple. In my view, they perform no beneficial service to the United States while raising a cloud of doubt and suspicion over sugar quotas and how they are fixed.

These lobbyists receive pay which ranges as high as \$50,000 a year. They have nothing to peddle but influence.

If they have influence and succeed in peddling it, to that degree, they harm our governmental system, compromise public officials and thus weaken our Nation.

If they have no influence, they take their client's money without rendering expected service in return. This carries the probability of disillusionment and bitterness on the part of the client toward the United States.

Either way the interests of the United States are impaired.

October 7, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A5651

The Immigration Act of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, one of the great moral victories of 1965—a victory as well for the strengthening of our Nation and the benefit of our people—was the enactment of a long overdue reform in our immigration laws, the abolition of the 40-year-old national origins quota system. This was the system of choosing immigrants chiefly according to where they had been born.

Four President had urged action to end this discriminatory system: Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson. In January of this year, President Johnson sent Congress a bill to replace the national origins quota system with a system for choosing immigrants on the basis of their family relationships to people living in the United States, or those possessing special skills and talents of real benefit to our country.

In his message, President Johnson said:

The national origins quota system does incalculable harm. The procedures imply that men and women from some countries are, just because of where they come from, more desirable citizens than others. We have no right to disparage the ancestors of millions of our fellow Americans in this way. Relationships with a number of countries, and hence the success of our foreign policy, is needlessly impeded by this proposition.

The quota system has other grave defects. Too often it arbitrarily denies us immigrants who have outstanding and sorely needed talents and skills. I do not believe this is either good government or good sense.

Thousands of our citizens are needlessly separated from their parents or other close relatives.

For more than 8 months, the Houses and committees of Congress held hearings on the bill, studied it, and debated it. It finally passed both Houses overwhelmingly. The bill passed by Congress, which President Johnson signed on October 3 at the Statue of Liberty, could be truly called a "statute of equality," because it brings back into our immigration laws the traditional American virtues of fair treatment and equal opportunity.

At the same time, it should be made plain that the new law does not "let down the bars" on immigration, either on quantity or quality. The new law will not alter the many legal safeguards which prevent an influx of undesirables and protect our people against excessive or unregulated immigration. Nothing in the new law relieves any immigrant of the necessity of satisfying all our security requirements, and the requirements designed to exclude persons likely to become public charges. The total number of immigrants will not be significantly increased. No immigrants will be admitted who would contribute to unemployment in the United States; in fact, the safeguards against this have been strengthened.

Thus, through a combination of good leadership, good legislative judgment, and good public understanding, we have purged our immigration laws of a long-standing source of discrimination and ill-will, and in so doing we have benefited and strengthened our country and its traditions.

The American Indian in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1965

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, Doug Fulton, of the Ann Arbor News, has recently published a thoughtful and articulate article on the plight of American Indians living in Michigan. As Mr. Fulton has so sharply pointed out, we continue to ignore the problems that plague the American Indian. No one will deny that American Indians have, in the past, been badly treated at the hands of foreigners to his land; they are being badly treated to this day, Mr. Speaker, and I, for one, believe that it is time that we in the Congress thoroughly review the status, needs, and opportunities open to the American Indian in mid-20th-century U.S. society. I commend Mr. Fulton's article to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress:

WHAT OF INDIANS' CIVIL RIGHTS?

(By Doug Fulton)

On the sidelines of the fight for civil rights a group of Americans stands alone.

They have put on no demonstrations, nor sit-ins, nor have they picketed.

Few outside groups have taken up their cause, and the publicity they have received in their quest for justice and dignity has been relegated to the back pages, if it has appeared at all.

And yet their cause is far older, and their list of grievances far longer, than that of any other minority in the United States.

They are the American Indians—the original Americans—and they once had possession of this great country of ours from the Atlantic to the Pacific. They welcomed and befriended the first American settlers, and we paid them back by slaughter, confiscation of their lands, and ostracism.

The pattern continues to this day. Only a short time ago an entire reservation, which had been promised in a treaty signed by the Father of our Country, George Washington, to remain theirs forever, was confiscated by the Federal Government for a dam and reservoir. The Indians were moved from their ancestral home and crowded onto a strange place. Congress is still delaying payment for their lands.

All this in the 20th century, when talk of civil rights rolls from the tongues of politicians and daily echoes in the legislatures across the land.

Nor is this the last. Other Indian lands, treaty reservations, are eyed hungrily by other interests, and ways are being sought to get them from their rightful owners.

The breaking of treaties is nothing new to the Indian. He has grown accustomed to it. He reminds himself, among other things, that he was never given payment, as required by the treaty he signed, for thousands of square miles in Michigan (including the land on which the State Capitol stands).

He is accustomed also to being ignored by the strangers who have taken over his land.

Ask a Michigander, for instance, to tell you how many reservations we have in the State, and not one in a thousand has the correct answer. Most, in fact, will look puzzled and comment they didn't know there were any at all.

There are five reservations in the State—L'Anse, Hannahville, Bay Mills, Saginaw, and Isabella. About 1,200 Indians live on these reservations. In addition, another thousand or so living off the reservation are considered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs as coming under their jurisdiction to a greater or lesser extent.

There are, of course, many more who have left the reservation, and have, as the BIA puts it, "entered the mainstream of American life." Some of these still maintain contact with friends and relatives at home, others do not. There is no accurate count of these—not even an educated guess.

Michigan has made little real effort to help the plight of its Indian citizens. True, there have been token efforts, but most of the so-called help has been mere lipservice to the cause.

There have been several commissions through the years designed to better the Indian's lot, but most have failed because they attempted to tell the Indian what he should do, rather than elicit his cooperation and help in working out a plan which would be suitable for him.

This plan of attack is all too familiar to the Indian, and he is rightly suspicious of it.

He remembers, for instance, the long, enforced marches of the 19th century and the grand relocation plans forced upon him. He remembers how certain tribes were given land "forever" in Kansas on which to settle, and then how it was later taken away when the white men discovered it was fertile and "too good" for them.

He remembers, too, the attempt of the Government to force him to become a farmer, and how the Government gave him land for this purpose which had no arable soil and no water.

Now a new Indian commission is to be formed in the State, and 7 of its 11 members, by law, must be Indians. But there is no clause in the law which says these seven are to be elected by the Indians themselves. So the Indian wonders if his representatives are really going to represent him or be mere puppets of the status quo. Or worse yet, are they going to try another "solution" as unrealistic as everything that has been tried so far.

He cannot hope, for there is nothing on which to base this hope. The history of his people tells him not to hope.

It is, perhaps, wrong to generalize, and yet there are some generalizations which seem to be valid when talking about the Indian.

One of these is that he does not care to adapt to an 8-to-5 job 5 days a week. And in saying this it must not be assumed he is lazy. Far from it. For in the culture in which he grew up a lazy Indian soon became a dead one, and an improvident one did not last out a hard winter.

But, free spirit that he is, he does not want to be tied down.

One of the best examples of a successful business arrangement utilizing this characteristic of the Indian to its full advantage is that of the Old Town canoe factory in Maine. There the owners have constructed, within the huge barnlike factory, a number of small cubicles. An Indian wishing to work simply checks out his materials and works by himself in one of the small rooms. When he finishes the canoe he is free to take his pay and go, or he can check out more materials and start to work on another. The factory is open day and night, and it matters not to have a fixed time schedule.

A5652

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

October 7, 1965

This personal choice arrangement has been working for a long time.

The Mohawks, who have become famous for their high steel work on tall buildings, are but another example. Here their work is at a premium, and so they can change jobs or quit and come back as they will.

But most jobs, especially in this modern society with emphasis on the timeclock and our own cultural notions of group obligations, leave little room for individuality.

Another generalization which can be applied to the Indian is that he has a great deal of pride and dignity. It is this part of his character that makes him so unwilling to ask for help, or to volunteer, even when asked, an opinion about how he shall be helped. He would rather slip into the direst condition of poverty and neglect than to beg. He wants what is rightfully his, which is the reason he has pressed his claims for payment of land taken away from him a century or more ago, but he does not want a handout.

This latter facet of character makes it difficult to give him the help he so desperately needs. It is the reason all the previous commissions have failed to do any real good. Lacking a directive from the Indian himself, and having as members people who were not attuned to the Indian character, they struck out blindly for solutions which were not solutions at all.

In this rather gloomy picture of the plight of the Michigan Indian, there are a few bright spots.

First and foremost is a new desire on the part of some of the younger generation to preserve their customs and keep their identity as a people.

Several new Indian clubs have sprung up in the last few years designed to foster this link with the past and preservation of their heritage.

Gertrude Prokosch Kurath of Ann Arbor, one of the country's foremost authorities on ethnic dance and the author of a number of books and monographs on Indian culture, says the climate for such preservation, especially of dance, is much better now than at any time in the past. She is especially enthusiastic about the excellent job done by a new organization, the Grand River American Indian Society.

In just a little more than a year this group, under the direction and guidance of Chief Jack Neyome and Historian Jim Eagle Shaffer, has made a real effort to form a cohesive organization designed to foster a reawakening of the arts and dances of the Indian.

They sponsored a pow-wow in Lansing a short time ago which drew Indians from 11 different tribes, including one from Oklahoma and another from New York.

In addition, members of the society have traveled to other gatherings throughout the State to assist in fairs and dancing.

The North American Indian Club of Detroit is another such organization. It sponsors at least one fair of arts and dancing each year, and this year's powwow is scheduled for Ford High School, on Evergreen Avenue, September 25-26.

El Thomas, Chief Little Elk, of the Isabella Reservation south of Mount Pleasant, puts on a weekend powwow each year. This year, crowds of more than 200 spectators attended the afternoon and evening performances.

There probably would be far greater crowds at these affairs if some way could be found to publicize them properly. But the Indians do not have any sort of statewide organization and no public relations man. So word of mouth is about all the publicity they get. It is too bad, for, if more people could visit the reservations, there might be less reluctance on the part of citizens to consider the Indian and his plight.

Another bright spot is the return of some of the native crafts, or arts, especially among the younger generation. True, it has not

reached in Michigan the status of some of the southwestern arts, and it is still only a part-time or leisure-time activity. Handwork of this sort is difficult to sell at a fair market price, but nevertheless an effort is being made to preserve the skills of long ago.

But the dancing and the arts will mean nothing in the long run unless the basic lot of the Indian is improved. And each day a solution is delayed, the harder it will be to catch up.

America has never had a bigger blot on her shield than her treatment of the Indian, and it is a blot which will be hard to erase.

We have come a long way from the old frontiersman philosophy that the only good Indian is a dead Indian, but we have not come far enough.

The Indian is here still, and if his presence is an embarrassing reminder of our treatment of him and his ancestors, we show little desire to admit it.

But admit it we must.

America has been called the great melting pot, and we are proud of our treatment of the various ethnic groups which make up the United States. We are proud we can assimilate them into our culture and still, if they wish, let them retain some measure of their individuality.

The people of Holland, Mich., can grow tulips and clop around in wooden shoes, and build windmills and other remembrances of an Old World heritage. Chinatowns appear in every large city, as do clusters of other races, each holding to native customs, language, and roots.

But the Indian is told to conform—to "enter the mainstream of American life."

Perhaps it is because they are a mute reminder of what our forefathers did to them long ago.

But time is running out, and the other examples of fights for human and civil rights should have jarred our complacency enough to cast about for a realistic solution to one of the oldest problems our country has faced.

Congress Compiles Outstanding Conservation Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, conservation is certainly something in which we all share an interest. As a Member of the 89th Congress, I am very proud of our legislative record in the area of conservation.

I was pleased to see the summary of our conservation record which appeared in the October 1 issue of Conservation News, an educational service of the National Wildlife Federation. As the article points out, the conservation record of the 89th Congress is being compared to the remarkable record of the 88th Congress—the "Conservation Congress."

Under unanimous consent I place the article, "Congress Compiles Outstanding Conservation Record," at this point in the RECORD:

CONGRESS COMPILES OUTSTANDING CONSERVATION RECORD

Members of the 89th Congress can go home, when adjournment of the first session finally comes, secure in the full assurance that they have done an outstanding job on

the enactment of conservation legislation. Significant accomplishments this year, in fact, are being compared to the remarkable record of the 88th Congress—the "Conservation Congress."

Enjoying exceptional cooperation and support from President Lyndon B. Johnson, congressional leaders have tallied major gains in a surprisingly diverse number of resource fields—water conservation and pollution control, air pollution control, the establishment of new public outdoor recreational areas, public use of agricultural areas, and highway beautification.

Here is the scoresheet of accomplishments racked up thus far, with additions a probability before adjournment comes, likely late in October:

WATER CONSERVATION

S. 4, the "Water Quality Act of 1965," creates a new Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, provides for the establishment of water quality criteria, and otherwise strengthens the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

"Water Resources Planning Act" (Public Law 89-80), establishes a program for river basin studies and makes grants to States for planning.

"Federal Water Project Recreation Act" (Public Law 89-72), sets up procedures for allocating costs for fish and wildlife and recreational enhancement at Federal reservoirs, a process many people view with mixed emotions.

The saline water conversion program of the Department of the Interior is to be expanded, extended, and accelerated (Public Law 89-119).

PUBLIC OUTDOOR RECREATION

Establishment of Assateague Island National Seashore, Md. and Va. (Public Law 89-195), preserves one of the last important beaches on the east coast.

Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area (Public Law 89-158) provides an important outdoor recreational facility near major population centers in the East.

Establishment of the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area sets aside 100,000 acres of scenic lands in West Virginia.

Beautiful Upper Priest Lake in Idaho is preserved through provision (Public Law 89-39) for the acquisition of land by the Forest Service.

Six other new units are added to the National Park System: Golden Spike National Monument (Public Law 89-102), commemorating the spot in Utah where the first transcontinental railroad was completed; Pecos National Monument (Public Law 89-54), preserving a 17th-century Spanish mission and ancient Indian pueblo in New Mexico; Agate Fossil Beds National Monument (Public Law 89-33), preserving unique paleontological deposits in Nebraska; Allabates Flint Quarries and Texas Panhandle Pueblo Culture National Monument (Public Law 89-154), Tex.; Nez Perce National Historical Park (Public Law 89-19) preserves important historical sites in Idaho; and Hubbell Trading Post National Historic Site, Ariz. (Public Law 89-148).

AGRICULTURE

The Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 contains cropland adjustment features of benefit to wildlife and providing incentives for farmers to open their lands to public hunting, fishing, trapping, and hiking.

Garrison Diversion Unit (Public Law 89-108) provides for major wildlife facilities as part of a huge irrigation project in the Missouri River Basin of North Dakota.

AIR POLLUTION

Amends the Clean Air Act (S. 306) to broaden authority of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to control air pollution from motor vehicles and provide for solid-waste disposal.

October 7, 1965

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000100040001-6

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A5637

"DEAR SIR: It is a pleasure to let you know we appreciate you being our Congressman, and all the things you are doing for us. I am taking training at Jackson, Ohio, at the manpower training center. It is a wonderful opportunity for people who aren't qualified for a job. We have good instructors. We are grateful to all of you that helped get the training started.

"Yours truly,

"ROBIE SLUSHER"

This letter eventually reached the desk of the President of the United States. President Johnson said the letter "gave him a heartwarming insight into the value of the manpower training program."

Robie was proud of his letter to the Congressman. He was proud to be able to write to his family. He was proud to be able to help his smaller children.

A new world was opening for Robie Slusher. He continued his studies and his training at the manpower training center. But it ended this past weekend for Robie. He died of a heart attack at his home to the shock of his family and friends and fellow students and instructors at the manpower training center.

But we don't think Robie's training was in vain. And Robie was but one of many students in the basic education classes at the manpower center who are showing tremendous progress.

Robie's instructor Art Jenkins and the training center director Clarence Gingerich report almost unbelievable progress in this area and other areas of the training program. "It is fantastic in many cases to see the development and growth of the individuals," says Director Gingerich.

Robie Slusher, a man coming out of a shell, will be mourned. But the program he was part of will go on.

What Is at Stake in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1965

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor recently carried an editorial which I believe is the clearest and most compelling argument for President Johnson's policies in Vietnam that has been published to date. With typical restraint, but with incisive logic—and the facts to back it up—the Monitor has, in my opinion, completely demolished all the arguments that have been used against our involvement in that war-torn country. The editorial acknowledges the criticism of our policy, but concludes:

We believe the first signs are now coming from that troubled and unhappy land that the policy was right, even though the end desired may still be far away. A change in mood is reported from Saigon. And the United States seems to be making the point that was so needed—that it simply cannot and will not be ejected from South Vietnam by force.

I hope all of my colleagues will read this excellent editorial:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 25, 1965]

WHAT IS AT STAKE IN VIETNAM

Ambassador Arthur Goldberg told the United Nations General Assembly, Thurs-

day, that the Chinese Communists were trying "to transfer the country of South Vietnam into a proving ground for their theories." Their theories, in effect, are that "people's revolutionary wars"—in other words, wars that are likely to bring to power Communists tributary to Peking—are just, must be supported, and will end in victory for the revolutionaries.

Chinese Defense Minister Lin Biao wrote the other day: "The spiritual atom bomb that the revolutionary people possess is a far more powerful and useful weapon than the physical atom bomb."

This statement of Marshal Lin's appeared in the manifesto on which Ambassador Goldberg commented with such vigor in his United Nations speech. In the manifesto, too, was a sentence which—placed alongside Mr. Goldberg's words quoted above—points up the confrontation and the incompatible positions in Vietnam. "The United States," the marshal wrote, "has made South Vietnam a testing ground for the suppression of people's war."

Such phrases of doubletalk have been made familiar in this age by the Communists, but the basic situation is age old. The conflict in Vietnam results from a collision on the frontier between the legitimate areas of power of two giants.

The United States—the only one of the three actual or potential superpowers that is an air and sea power rather than a land power—is legitimately concerned with what happens, not only along its own coastline, but on the far shores of the two oceans that bound it. For an air or sea power, the opposite shore is always a possible launching pad for air or sea attacks. (In the old days, that is why Britain always reacted when it saw a threat on the far side of the English Channel.)

Thus the United States has a justifiable interest in what happens along the Pacific coast of Asia. This explains and validates its present commitments in Japan, in South Korea, in the Philippines—and in South Vietnam.

Looking outward from the Asian heartland, the Chinese Communists see this same rim of Asia as the frontier of their power. And so they find themselves in collision with the United States. Under normally civilized conditions, a *modus vivendi* surely could be found—as the United States and the Soviet Union eventually found one at a point where they were in collision in Europe. This was in Austria. But an Austrian settlement would never have come about, had the Soviets committed themselves to ousting the Americans from the country by force—as the Chinese, subtly and indirectly, have committed themselves to ousting the Americans from Vietnam.

There has been this year sharp criticism from some quarters within the free world of President Johnson's policy of escalation in Vietnam. We believe the first signs are now coming from that troubled and unhappy land that the policy was right, even though the end desired may still be far away. A change in mood is reported from Saigon. And the United States seems to be making the point that was so needed—that it simply cannot and will not be ejected from South Vietnam by force.

There is repeated evidence from President Johnson himself—and most recently in Ambassador Goldberg's speech—that the U.S. purpose in Vietnam is indeed not war but peace and tranquility for all Asia. We believe in the sincerity of the administration's invitation to the United Nations to help find a way to peace. And, generally speaking, the path chosen by the administration this year is the one most likely to produce the right kind of peace.

The Immigration Act—A Milestone in International Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, this Nation passed an historic milestone in its international relations on October 3 when President Johnson signed the new immigration bill abolishing the national origins quota system.

For 40 years we have suffered a stain to remain on our statute books and on the beautiful lady on Liberty Island who watches over our New York gateway and in whose shadow the President signed this historic bill.

Beginning in 1924, we proclaimed to the world that a person's contribution to our national well-being, and his right to join our national community, was to be judged in large part by the place of his birth or the country of his ancestors. This theme, so repugnant to our ideas of the equality of man, has haunted us at home and abroad for four decades.

By the act of October 3 we shall no longer be concerned with a man's birthplace or ancestry but he will be judged on two factors only: His relationship to citizens or aliens already here and the skills and talents he may bring with him, the better to help us in forging our national society.

No one should fear these changes. More importantly, no fears should be entertained that we are substantially increasing our immigration; relaxing our standards of admission; or prejudicing the jobs we hold. The bill authorizes a purely nominal increase in total immigration. It does not change any of the grounds of inadmissibility or deportability.

The new law does not prohibit the entry of aliens who do not have the relationship or the skills which result in a preferential treatment. It does not permit such an immigrant to come here, but only after preference classes have been taken care of and only if the Secretary of Labor has determined that his admission to this country will not undermine the wages and working conditions of the employed American.

No longer, however, will the immigrant without family ties or outstanding talent be able to migrate here immediately because he was born in northern or western Europe, while a U.S. citizen waits for years before his aged parents from southern or eastern Europe can obtain a quota number.

No longer will the scientist from southern Asia be kept from joining the staff of an American university because only 100 persons may be allowed to enter this country annually from his native land.

No longer will the refugee from communism's tyranny and oppression be stigmatized by being "paroled" into the

A5638

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

United States, a term too closely associated with the status of the released criminal. For the first time in our immigration experience, a specific authorization for the orderly entry of 10,700 such refugees annually has been incorporated into our basic law.

The new law is not a general revision of the patchwork quilt of sometimes obscure and sometimes contradictory legislation on immigration which occupies over 175 pages of our statute books. It is, however, a clear-cut repudiation of the fallacious and demeaning philosophy which constituted the national origins quota system. In the best sense of the term it is a selfish law. While its provisions give greater hope to those outside our gates, in the elimination of this 20th century shibboleth the greatest beneficiaries of the law are the American people.

I am proud to have been a sponsor of this legislation and to have been present at the historic ceremonies on Liberty Island when our President signed the immigration bill and reaffirmed our national policy.

Art in Iowa Besmirched

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1965

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, the Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Gazette is deeply concerned that Members of this body, and Americans all over this country, may have gotten the impression that Iowans are not concerned about arts and humanities.

As a gesture of friendliness to my neighbor State of Iowa, and lest some Members actually believe Iowans do not care for art, I include as part of my remarks the Gazette editorial of October 2, 1965, "Art in Iowa Besmirched":

ART IN IOWA BESMIRCHED

When the U.S. House of Representatives this month approved a bill to subsidize the arts and humanities with grants of \$21 million for each of 3 years, Iowa's Representative H. R. Gross made nationwide news in his effort to beat the bill by ridicule.

We are not convinced that Federal aid to artists, performers and scholars will be altogether good for them or for the country, but we do see regrettable flaws in derision as a weapon of attack.

Representative Gross misreads the attitude of many Iowans and does no service to the State in spreading an impression that Iowans belittle the arts or consider them silly and subject to scorn. His opposition in the House had that effect through several deadpan Gross amendments, all rejected.

One proposed that belly-dancing be included in the arts definition. Another would have added to it "baseball, football, golf, tennis, squash, pinocle and poker." Another suggested direct arts aid to Appalachia and the "poverty-stricken areas of New York and New Jersey."

With this approach, Representative Gross perpetuated tactics used for years by a self-styled "boob bloc" of congressional wits in their generally successful move to laugh arts

bills off the floor. This time he alone led the snicker assault. It fell extremely flat. The arts-and-humanities subsidy bill won overwhelming passage, and more bills like it doubtless will appear in years ahead.

When it comes to Iowa's involvement in the arts, a far more fitting theme for national exposure would stress what Iowa has done in arts promotion fund-raising efforts for a million-dollar art gallery project on the University of Iowa campus are nearing success. Cedar Rapids is completing a campaign for \$250,000 in contributions to remodel its art center building. Des Moines has an art center known and respected throughout the State. So does Davenport. So does Marshalltown. So do several other Iowa communities whose interest mirrors that of countless Iowans in tune with cultural enrichment progress everywhere.

To contradict this with misleading, stale comedy in Congress paints a picture both phony and harmful. The oldtime boob-bloc image was deserved and apropos, perhaps, but now it belongs to a bygone day that no true spokesman for the State should wrongly advertise.

Education's Keys to Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1965

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel this week delivered a significant address on the subject of the role of the Federal Government in American education.

He appeared before a seminar of the Educational Writers Association, meeting at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, Tuesday, October 5.

One of the reoccurring themes we hear so often, from some quarters, is that with the increasing Federal participation in the Nation's educational processes, there will follow Federal control and eventual domination, as surely as night follows day.

Commissioner Keppel does not believe that this is true, nor has to be the case. Neither do I. I think the Commissioner has successfully harpooned this argument. In his outstanding talk, he points out that the Federal Government, in reality, is a "junior partner," with the States and local governments, in American education.

Mr. Keppel correctly emphasizes that the Federal Government has had a vital interest in American education extending back virtually to the start of this Nation. He points out that today American education is not controlled in Washington, but in the State capitals, the local school districts, and the classrooms of this country. Support for education in the United States is predominantly in the hands of State and local governments. Even with the sharp increase in Federal contributions to our education processes in the past several years, notably through outstanding educational programs of the 88th Congress, "the education Congress" and the present session of the 89th Congress, the Federal Government invests less than 8 percent of

its gross funds for all educational purposes, while the States allocate about 35 percent of their gross funds to the schools, while local governments invest 45 percent.

In his talk before the Education Writers Tuesday, Commissioner Keppel pointed out that the Governors and educators attending the recent Interstate Compact for Education conference in Kansas City, Mo., acknowledged the increasing need for Federal financial help to the Nation's school systems. On the other hand, they also urged stronger leadership in this area on the part of the States and local governments. In this, Commissioner Keppel agrees. And so do I. And, I feel sure, so do the great majority of the Members of the Congress.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 spells this out. As Commissioner Keppel points out:

Title V of the act is directed to help strengthen our State departments of education, the pivotal agencies on which we must depend if we mean to keep American education both strong and decentralized.

I firmly believe that the continued effectiveness of the Federal-State-local partnership in the field of education, as well as in many others, will depend to a great degree upon the kind of leadership exercised by the States and local education agencies. I believe it will be strong and vigorous.

I would like to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to Commissioner Keppel upon his additional, new title, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Education.

Under unanimous consent, I insert Commissioner Keppel's remarks at this point:

EDUCATION'S KEYS TO SUCCESS

(An address by Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, before a seminar of the Education Writers Association, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., October 5, 1965)

It is good to be here with you today, to resume our continuing discourse on what's new in American education.

Washington clearly has provided education news in abundance this year. It will doubtless continue to do so.

The President feels strongly about the urgency of strengthening education. So does the Congress. So, it is clear, do the American people.

And yet I think that all of us here in Washington look toward the day when the most dramatic news about American education will be developing beyond this capital city—across the country in our State capitals and, particularly, in the educational agencies established by our States to administer our education structure.

During the 88th and now the 89th Congress, we have seen the greatest array of education acts in the Nation's history—acts that establish a vigorous and effective relationship among local, State, and Federal activities for improving education at all levels. Recognizing that the strength of our schools and colleges and universities has become an overriding national concern, our elected representatives have called for strong national participation and national support, in partnership with the States and local communities.

For the Federal Government to participate in education—to be a partner, a junior partner, with the States and local communi-

eign Relations Committee at the Senate and that none of the three remaining partners of the firm had even known the name of our firm, and this had been most embarrassing to them, but especially to Mr. Karasik. They stated that at a future time they would probably have to appear before the subcommittee again. They also stated that they would let me know if anything developed.

"Some months passed and on Sunday evening, June 16, 1963, Mr. Surrey called me and stated it would be necessary for them to appear before the subcommittee again and they were then going to discuss the possible employment of our firm in open hearings on June 20, 1963.

"I met with Mr. Surrey, Mr. Karasik, and Mr. Gould on the morning of June 17, 1963. For reasons involving the nonlegal activities of one of my partners, I felt it would be most unfortunate for any of our firm to be brought to public interest at the time, since even though there was certainly no question of the propriety of the behavior of myself or any member of this firm, the public might unfavorably misinterpret the facts.

"I therefore requested Mr. Surrey that I be permitted to testify, so I could set the record straight for myself and our firm, but in executive session.

"In conclusion, neither I nor my law firm, nor any member of my firm, have done any work for nor in association with Mr. Efron's firm, nor have we received any fee, directly or indirectly from the firm or any partners; nor have we even referred any case or matter to the firm or any of the partners, or had any professional contact with other than my taking Mr. Efron to see Mr. Menefee as described above."

REQUEST TO TESTIFY

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Fagelson, as I stated in the beginning, you requested through Mr. Surrey to appear here, didn't you?

Mr. FAGELSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You understand that executive meetings of this committee may be made public, don't you, by action of the committee?

Mr. FAGELSON. I understand that, sir. [Deleted.]

TIME OF OFFER FROM MR. EFRON

The CHAIRMAN. About what date did Mr. Efron offer this retainer to you and discuss this matter?

Mr. FAGELSON. I am not sure of the exact date, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It was 1956.

Mr. FAGELSON. My best memory is that it was probably very early in 1956 after the Christmas season.

The CHAIRMAN. You state in your affidavit early 1956.

Mr. FAGELSON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he tell you at that time the status of the sugar bill then under consideration in the Congress?

Mr. FAGELSON. We discussed it. I understood that the sugar bill was before the Senate and the Senate Finance Committee would hold hearings on it. I think, I understand that a bill had passed the House or was about to pass the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, did you not understand that the committee, the Senate Finance Committee, had held hearings on it and had reported it?

Didn't he discuss what you were to do about the bill?

Mr. FAGELSON. It is my memory, sir, that the Finance Committee was holding hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. You so understood it?

Mr. FAGELSON. But I cannot be sure.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, all right; is that all?

Mr. FAGELSON. I was going to say I am quite sure I was to discuss his idea; I would discuss this principally with Senator Byrd and other Members of the Senate.

MEMORANDUM OF JANUARY 28, 1956

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Fagelson, I show you a copy of a memorandum dated January 28, 1956, addressed to Secretary Troncoso, and signed "Monroe Karasik" and ask if you have seen this document before?

Mr. FAGELSON. Yes, sir; I saw this once.

The CHAIRMAN. You have seen it?

Mr. FAGELSON. Yes, sir.

(A copy of the document referred to follows:)

SURREY, KARASIK, GOULD & EFRON,
Washington, D.C.

To: Secretary Troncoso.

From: Monroe Karasik.

Through channels of personal obligation we have made contact with a powerful law firm in the Senator's home State.

The senior member of the firm is the executive officer of the Senator's political machine. The second partner is the son of the Senator's first campaign manager; there are very close family connections between this man and the Senator. The third partner is the private confidential attorney of the Senator; he handles important confidential matters for the Senator's machine.

All three propose to call upon the Senator on Monday, January 30, to engage his sympathy for the position of the Dominican Republic with respect to sugar legislation. They will represent themselves as being interested purely because of their very close ties of friendship and business with my firm. Each of the three will adopt a different approach to arouse the Senator's sympathy.

They ask for a retainer fee of \$2,500. In addition to this, they ask a fee of \$5,000 if the Dominican allocation under the legislation as finally enacted is no less than that under the present House version of H.R. 7030. If the Dominican allocation does turn out to be less than this, but is of a size which my firm in its sole judgment considers to be a satisfactory figure, the contingent fee to be paid would be only \$2,500.

We believe that these lawyers can be effective in advancing the interests of the Dominican Republic, and we accordingly recommend that the retainer fee be paid, and the contingent fee be agreed, all as outlined above.

MONROE KARASIK.

CIUDAD TRUJILLO, D.S.D., January 28, 1956.

WITNESS' FIRST SIGHT ON JANUARY 28, 1956

The CHAIRMAN. When did you first see it?

Mr. FAGELSON. I saw this early in the spring, the one time I met Mr. Surrey and Mr. Gould and Mr. Karasik.

The CHAIRMAN. What spring?

Mr. FAGELSON. This spring, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. This year?

Mr. FAGELSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. About when?

Mr. FAGELSON. I really can't tell you, sir. It was early in the spring.

The CHAIRMAN. Was it in March?

Mr. FAGELSON. It very possibly or probably was in March.

The CHAIRMAN. Was it after they appeared before the committee?

Mr. FAGELSON. It was my understanding it was right after they had appeared before this committee that was when Mr. Efron called me.

The CHAIRMAN. Was it the day after they appeared here?

Mr. FAGELSON. I don't know whether it was the day after but it was very shortly after they appeared because Mr. Efron called me that night and he was very much concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. He testified that he called you on March 14, is that correct?

Mr. FAGELSON. Well, he would probably remember the date, sir. I cannot remember. I just know it was early in the spring, sir. But it was right after they had appeared before this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. They appeared before this committee on March 13 and he testified just now—

Mr. FAGELSON. I would never question that, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That he called you on March 14. I just wondered if that was in accord with your best recollection.

Mr. FAGELSON. My best memory is it was in the spring, sir, I am sorry. But he said they had just appeared before this committee. It was right after that.

The CHAIRMAN. You have the memorandum before you.

Mr. FAGELSON. Yes, sir.

ACCURACY OF DESCRIPTION

The CHAIRMAN. The first paragraph says—"Through channels of personal obligation we have made contact with a powerful law firm in the Senator's home State."

Is that a good description of your law firm?

Mr. FAGELSON. No, sir; it is not.

The CHAIRMAN. Why not?

Mr. FAGELSON. Well, we are a good Alexandria law firm but by no stretch of the imagination could we be considered a powerful law firm, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have any personal obligations to Mr. Efron?

Mr. FAGELSON. No, sir; I have no personal obligations to Mr. Efron.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you at that time?

Mr. FAGELSON. No, sir; I did not.

The CHAIRMAN. What was your relation to Mr. Efron?

Mr. FAGELSON. I had met him socially. [Deleted.] After meeting him at a party or maybe two, he invited me to his home to dinner. I reciprocated. We probably visited each other's homes several times. We met in Washington once or twice by accident, and stopped and talked and on one occasion I think we had lunch.

The CHAIRMAN. You had no business relations with him, only social?

Mr. FAGELSON. Never any business relations with him, sir.

IDENTITY OF SENIOR MEMBER OF FIRM

The CHAIRMAN. The next paragraph says, "The senior member of the firm is the executive officer of the Senator's political machine."

Who does that refer to?

Mr. FAGELSON. Well, the senior member of my firm, sir, is Leroy Bendheim.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he the executive officer of the Senator's political machine, was he at that time?

Mr. FAGELSON. I read this letter. Can I say, sir, this is the most absurd and ridiculous thing I can say. He has never been an executive in the Senator's organization.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. What organization?

Mr. FAGELSON. Well, in Virginia, sir, we call the group of which Senator Byrd is the titular and respected head, the organization, sir.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I see.

The CHAIRMAN. He calls it the political machine here. That is the same thing?

Mr. FAGELSON. We don't consider the organization quite a political machine, sir. We think a political machine is something like they have in big cities in the East.

The CHAIRMAN. Then that first statement you say is incorrect?

Mr. FAGELSON. Well, it is absolutely ridiculous, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you tell anything like this to Mr. Efron?

Mr. FAGELSON. I did not. I am absolutely certain I did not. I couldn't have.

ACCURACY OF REFERENCE TO WITNESS

The CHAIRMAN. "The second partner is the son of the Senator's first campaign manager."

Mr. FAGELSON. I am No. 2 on the list.

October 7, 1965

The CHAIRMAN. I mean the second partner.

Mr. FAGELSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you the son of the Senator's first campaign manager?

Mr. FAGELSON. My father is one of the men in Virginia who thinks of Senator Byrd as a close personal friend and would do most anything for him. But he has never managed the Senator's campaign.

With all due deference to my father who is a wonderful man he has neither the background nor the experience to manage a campaign.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. May I ask if your father is in the same position as the mother they told the story about at the meeting I was at the other day that said the slogan in Virginia was "Love God and trust Harry Byrd."

Mr. FAGELSON. I think that my father might well fit that description.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I don't say that facetiously.

Mr. FAGELSON. I don't think it is considered so to a man of my father's generation.

Senator MORSE. Mr. Chairman, could I ask on that point one quick question?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator MORSE. Mr. Fagelson, was your father at any time the campaign manager of Senator Byrd for Alexandria or for northern Virginia?

Mr. FAGELSON. I can answer that, sir, by saying that when Senator Byrd ran for Governor in 1924 my father was one of a group who worked for him very hard, sir, and devoted a great deal of time. But he was not anywhere near the position of being the campaign manager. He is a fine person, sir. He just doesn't have the educational background to be a campaign manager.

IDENTITY OF THIRD PARTNER

The CHAIRMAN. The third partner" it reads "is the private confidential attorney of the Senator."

Who is the third partner?

Mr. FAGELSON. The third partner, sir, is Mr. Bragg. Mr. Bragg is a good title man. He and I specialize in the title part of the firm. But he doesn't do any trial work or handle any work and as far as I know has never had any contact with Senator Byrd.

The CHAIRMAN. Was he the third partner at that time?

Mr. FAGELSON. Yes, sir. Actually we had four partners at that time. [Deleted.]

The CHAIRMAN. Glammittorio.

Mr. FAGELSON. Glammittorio is the fourth partner and he is our trial man.

The CHAIRMAN. Was either one of them the private confidential attorney to the Senator?

Mr. FAGELSON. I can truthfully say, sir, that he unquestionably could never have been Senator Byrd's private confidential attorney. [Deleted.]

QUESTION OF WITNESSES' DESCRIPTION OF HIS FIRM TO MR. EFRON

The CHAIRMAN. Did you tell, make statements similar to this to Mr. Efron?

Mr. FAGELSON. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. At any time?

Mr. FAGELSON. I can tell you truthfully, whatever I told Mr. Efron, I couldn't have told him anything like this because this is ridiculous. I unquestionably discussed with Mr. Efron and not in any great detail the members of my firm because he said they were interested. [Deleted.]

The CHAIRMAN. Is it proper to say this describes your law firm?

Mr. FAGELSON. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It does not?

Mr. FAGELSON. Not by—I am trying—I am not trying to be funny. We are not even a poor man's description of this law firm, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. When you saw this letter, this memorandum, did you tell Mr. Karasik that this was not a description of your firm?

Mr. FAGELSON. I couldn't believe at first that it could even refer to mine, but I specifically stated, I may have used the same word I have used here, absurd, or ridiculous or something like that and it is.

The CHAIRMAN. It was not descriptive of your law firm?

Mr. FAGELSON. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What did he say when you told him that? He wrote this memorandum.

Mr. FAGELSON. Well, he was upset that evening, and he kept saying, "Are you sure that this is outrageous?" and I said it is, or words to that effect.

I think he felt, too, that it could not have been my law firm, I mean that this description could not have fit my law firm.

DENIAL BY WITNESS OF PROPOSED JANUARY 30 MEETING

The CHAIRMAN. The next paragraph reads, "All three" that is these three partners, "propose to call upon the Senator on Monday, January 30."

Is that correct? Was there such a proposal contemplated?

Mr. FAGELSON. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. When you discussed this with Efron?

Mr. FAGELSON. No, sir; I want to make it very plain that I never got beyond discussing, the possibility of being retained by Mr. Efron's firm.

The CHAIRMAN. By Mr. Efron's firm?

Mr. FAGELSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they explain you were to be retained by the Dominican Sugar Association?

Mr. FAGELSON. Yes, sir; I knew that. I phrased it badly. But in association with Mr. Efron's firm.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. FAGELSON. And they explain it and Mr. Efron was, he was very frank about it. He said he wanted somebody that could prepare the case in such a way that Senator Byrd could be convinced, but one Senator Byrd would be willing to listen to. There was no question in his mind but some question in mine as to whether I had any kind of entree like that to Senator Byrd.

IMMIGRATION BILL SIGNED INTO LAW

(Mr. GILBERT (at the request of Mr. HOWARD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to have been present to witness the signing of the new immigration bill by the President on last Sunday, October 3, 1965, at the historic site at the foot of the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor.

Earlier this year, President Johnson had sent a special message to Congress urging it to pass the administration's immigration reform bill. I was one of the sponsors of this bill, and as a member of the Immigration Subcommittee, I took an active part in the hearings and worked hard for committee approval, and for passage in the House.

As the President stated, the new law "repairs a deep and painful flaw in the fabric of American justice." It has brought to an end after 40 years a policy of immigration based on the country of birth of those desiring to come to the United States. This system of quotas based on national origins allowed a mere three countries to account for 70 percent of the total quotas. And, ironically, these

countries fell short of their quotas by about 50,000 a year—a number that could not be used by the people of other countries with long waiting lists. The system was undemocratic in concept, indicating that we considered people from certain nations less desirable than others, and it was often cruel in operation, keeping families from uniting because a parent or a son or daughter had been born in the wrong country.

The new law uses a standard we can all respect and one that reflects the true spirit of America. It says that those who apply for immigration to the United States will be allowed to enter because of their skills or their relationship to persons who are already citizens or residents of the United States. Selection from the total of those qualified for admission will be on a first-come, first-served basis.

No longer will be ask, "Where were you born?" Today, the question is "What can you contribute?" or "Whom do you have in this land?"

The old days of large-scale immigration to this Nation are long past, and no one seriously suggests that they be brought back. The new law is not designed to do so and will enlarge the immigration into this country only by the amount of the unused quotas—that is, by about 50,000 a year. As I have said, the main purpose of the law is simply to establish a system for choosing among those who want to come here that is fair and in the best interests of the Nation.

This legislation is the end product of 20 years of effort. President Truman pointed out that the national origins quota system was opposed to the American tradition and harmful to our foreign policy. President Eisenhower asked for a change in the system in 1956, calling attention to its discriminatory nature. President Kennedy, in proposing the bill that was the forerunner of the one submitted by President Johnson, called the system arbitrary. The action of the Congress this year has thus met the call of four Presidents and has brought us back to an admissions systems that we can administer with a clear conscience.

There are always those who are afraid that any change in immigration law will lead to a loss of jobs for our workers or an increase in our welfare rolls. They need have no fear on this score. The bill strengthens the provisions of the law under which the Secretary of Labor has the authority to keep out immigrants who would take work from our citizens or depress wages or working conditions here. And every immigrant under the bill, just as under prior law, must of course show that he will not become a public charge before he can obtain a visa to enter the United States.

The new law makes no changes in the safeguards of our present laws which prohibit the admission of subversives, persons and criminal records, narcotic addicts and other undesirables. The same strict standards that we have been enforcing in the past will continue as before.

All in all, the new act of Congress the President signed into law is one the whole Nation can be proud of. It will end unjust and sometimes cruel dis-

crimination. It will insure that persons with the best reasons for coming to our shores will receive first consideration. And it will produce no disruptions or dislocations in our Nation.

OUR SURRENDER OVER THE PANAMA CANAL

(Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. HOWARD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the extensive writings by columnists on interoceanic canal problems since the Presidential announcement on September 24, 1965, concerning the status of three proposed treaties now being negotiated with the Republic of Panama, I read with much interest a syndicated column by James J. Kilpatrick published in the Sunday Star of October 3, 1965.

The indicated column follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Oct. 3, 1965]

OUR SURRENDER OVER THE PANAMA CANAL (By James J. Kilpatrick)

Lyndon Johnson, a master of political poker, is playing his cards like a ribbon clerk in the high-stakes game of Latin American affairs. He has just lost the pot in Panama—lost it to a bluffer with a pair of deuces—and he has wasted his hole cards in Santo Domingo. What began as a good evening at the table is steadily becoming a nightmare.

On the face of it, the Panama treaty baffles understanding. Eighteen months ago, when the negotiations began, the forces of international communism made three objectives clear. They wanted the 1903 treaty abrogated; they wanted a recognition of Panama's sovereignty in the Canal Zone; and they wanted a greater cut of the revenue. Last week the President announced that he would send to the Senate a new agreement. Astoundingly, this new agreement will (1) abrogate the 1903 treaty, (2) recognize Panama's sovereignty, and (3) give Panama more money.

What kind of bargaining is this? What have our negotiators been doing all this time? The Canal Zone, up to this moment, has been a territorial possession of the United States. By virtue of treaty rights granted in perpetuity, we have rightfully exercised sovereignty there. The defense and canal installations represent an investment of billions of dollars in American tax funds. The record of the U.S. Government in Panama is a record of order, accomplishment, humanitarianism.

None of these considerations seems to have mattered at all. Nothing suggests that the U.S. negotiators made any bargaining use of the possibility—a devastating possibility for Panama—that a new sea level canal could be dug somewhere else. It is not accurate to describe this treaty as a sell-out, for a sell-out implies some payment in return for principles yielded. This is surrender, abject surrender, to a gang of blackmailers whose bluff came down to this: Throw in your hand or we'll riot again.

Pennsylvania's Dan Flood, in an outraged speech last Monday in the House, gave this new treaty the ugly word: Appeasement. And he ventured a prophecy that has the bell-like ring of truth: "I predict," he said, "that the expressed willingness to surrender control over the Panama Canal will be taken as a signal for accelerated activity among Communistic revolutionaries all over Latin America and the Caribbean."

How could it be otherwise? The capitulation to the Panamanian demagog follows

close upon the heels of an equally dismaying collapse of American policy in the Dominican Republic. What, now, does Mr. Johnson have to show for the 5 months that have elapsed since the insurrection of April 24?

In the spring, Mr. Johnson was hard and decisive. He acted partly from good intelligence, partly from sound instinct. What his eyes did not tell him, his nose did: The well-organized revolt reeked of Communist direction. Everyone could smell it—everyone, that is, but Senator Fulbright, the Times, the Trib, and the Washington Post.

What has become of that decisiveness now? The leading anti-Communist of the Dominican Republic, an honest soldier beloved by his troops, was General Elias Wessin y Wessin. We have deported him. One of the faint hopes for stability was that complex and glib man, Juan Bosch. He has returned to Santo Domingo, breathing fire and arrogance, and demanding of the United States a billion-dollar reparation. In the heart of Santo Domingo, Communist training activities continue undiminished. In the hills, the armed guerrillas wait.

Elsewhere in Latin America, the picture is no brighter. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee recently released a thin volume of testimony taken on August 4 in its investigation of Red Chinese infiltration of this hemisphere. Among the witnesses was Stanley Ross, editor of El Tiempo, a hard-nosed fellow who smiled out the Cuban missile sites ahead of everyone else. Without the slightest equivocation, he spoke of Red Chinese infiltration in Bolivia, Venezuela, Brazil, Guatemala, Colombia, and of course Cuba.

Few persons would suggest that Lyndon Johnson has an easy hand to play, at home or abroad, in coping with the Communist subversion of Latin America. Many of the Rightist leaders are no beauties; the President cannot conjure instant democracy out of the illiteracy of the cane fields; as John Kennedy once remarked, the most striking lesson of the Presidency often is to be found in how little a President can do. Here at home, a President pathetically eager for a consensus bleeds inside from the savage blows of the liberal Left.

But Mr. Johnson can do better than he has been doing lately. If he will only return to the hardness of April, and turn those riverboat eyes on the Reds, he can pull out of this mess. The draft treaty may yet be rejected, and the Dominican situation may yet be salvaged, but the game is running out of cards and not much time remains.

PANAMA CANAL: ABANDONMENT WOULD SOLVE NO PROBLEM

(Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. HOWARD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Presidential announcement on September 24, 1965, concerning the status of three proposed treaties now being negotiated with the Republic of Panama has evoked widespread comments in the press in many parts of the Nation on various aspects of the interoceanic canal problem.

Among the most ably prepared of such writings is one in the October 9, 1965, issue of Human Events by Dr. Donald M. Dozer, distinguished historian, now professor of history in the University of California at Santa Barbara. As a former key historian in the Department of State and distinguished student of Latin

American problems, including the Monroe Doctrine, on which he is the author of a recent important book published by Alfred A. Knopf of New York, Dr. Dozer writes with the authority of well-digested knowledge.

In this general connection, I would invite attention to my documented addresses on the "Interoceanic Canal Problem: Inquiry or Cover Up?" in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 1 and July 29, 1965.

The indicated article by Dr. Dozer and an accompanying statement by my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA] follow:

ABANDONMENT OF PANAMA CANAL WOULD SOLVE NO PROBLEM

(By Donald Marquand Dozer, professor of history, University of California at Santa Barbara)

In a sensational betrayal of U.S. interests President Lyndon Johnson announced on September 24 his decision to surrender to Panama sovereignty over the Canal Zone and to allow Panama to share with the United States "responsibility in the administration, management, and operations of the canal." The United States is thus yielding to Panama's Communist-inspired, anti-Yankee demonstrations and is abandoning its treaty rights in this vital international waterway.

We in the United States ought to feel a thrilling sense of pride in the Panama Canal. It was conceived by U.S. vision, was built by U.S. money, and is operated by a U.S. company, the Panama Canal Company, in which the Secretary of the Army is the sole stockholder.

The Panama Canal is a national enterprise of the United States. It is a lifeline of national defense. It is a main channel of ocean commerce and one of the greatest transportation facilities in the world. The prime function of the canal is the safe and expeditious transport of vessels from one ocean to the other. Of all the vessels that went through the Canal in 1962, over 60 percent were U.S. vessels.

The American people should nurse no sense of guilt about the canal. Panama emerged as an independent nation in 1903 only because of the U.S. interest in the construction of an Isthmian Canal.

The fact that the canal was constructed through Panama rather than through Nicaragua was due to the inducements which Panama offered in order to get the canal in her territory. As one of these inducements she agreed in the treaty of 1903 to give to the United States "in perpetuity" a zone of land 10 miles wide running through Panama from sea to sea and "all the rights, power and authority within the zone * * * which the United States would possess and exercise within the zone if it were the sovereign of the territory * * * to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power or authority."

Among these sovereign rights was the right to fly the flag of the United States over the zone "to the entire exclusion of the exercise" of such a right by Panama.

For all these rights the United States paid \$10 million immediately and began 9 years later to pay \$250,000 annually to Panama. Subsequently we purchased all the lands in the zone from their private owners, spending almost \$35 million for that purpose. We have paid more for the Canal Zone, both initially and subsequently, than for any other territory that we have ever acquired—the Louisiana Purchase, Florida, the Mexican Cession, the Gadsden Purchase, Alaska—in fact more than double what we paid for all those territorial acquisitions combined.

October 2, 1965

The total investment of the United States in the canal and the Canal Zone amounts to more than \$2 billion. This investment the Johnson administration is now giving away.

From the canal Panama's economy has derived enormous tangible benefits. In 1963 it received directly from U.S. agencies in the zone \$92 million in salaries, retirement, and disability payments, and purchases of goods and services besides many indirect benefits. As a result of the presence of the United States in the Canal Zone, Panama enjoys the highest per capita income in Latin America.

Beginning in the "Good Neighbor" era of the 1930's the United States has yielded concession after concession to Panama. By new treaties in 1936 and 1955 it abandoned its treaty right to maintain public order and to supervise sanitation in the terminal cities of Panama and Colon with the result that these cities have become beachheads of violence against the canal and cesspools of infection. The United States has given to Panama, without consideration, the terminal yards and passenger stations of the Panama Railroad in Panama City and Colon.

After the Communist-led rioting against the United States in the zone in 1959, a high State Department official on a visit to Panama recognized that "titular sovereignty over the Canal Zone remains in the Government of Panama." Soon afterward President Eisenhower by Executive order gave Panama the sovereign right to fly her flag in the zone.

Other concessions which U.S. policymakers have made to Panama, often under pressure from riots and other demonstrations, include abandonment of the zone commissaries, the increase in the annuity to \$1,930,000, the construction of the \$20 million Thatcher Bridge across the canal for the special use of Panama and the release of real estate in Panama City and Colon with a market value of \$40 million.

But with each concession we have been confronted with new demands from Panama, including a demand for one-half the gross revenue from the canal and ultimately surrender of the canal and the zone to Panama.

After further bloody Communist-led rioting occurred in the zone in 1954, President Johnson agreed to negotiate a new treaty with Panama. At the same time, he announced that the United States is prepared to scrap the present lock canal in favor of a new sea-level canal, which may be constructed elsewhere in Panama or in Nicaragua or in northwestern Colombia.

The pretext given for this announcement is that the present canal is becoming obsolete and will not be able to provide adequate accommodation for world commerce by the year 2000, possibly even by 1985.

But is a second canal constructed at sea level the only logical answer to this problem? A second canal, wherever located, will require the negotiation of a new treaty, possibly more than one, under extremely adverse negotiating conditions.

Such a treaty or treaties can be expected to involve huge indemnities by the United States to the other country, larger annuity payments by the United States than are now going to Panama, a limitation of the duration of United States control over the canal, and recognition of full sovereignty over the canal by the other signatory, making the canal built at U.S. expense a hostage to that country from the very outset. And at present the United States is prevented from carrying out the excavation of a new canal with atomic power by the terms of the nuclear test-ban treaty drafted by it, the Soviet Union, and Britain in 1963 and signed by more than 100 nations.

Of the routes proposed for a new canal, the Nicaragua-Costa Rica route, besides re-

quiring the negotiation of treaties with two and possibly three Central American countries, is almost three times as long as the present Panama Canal. A survey of this route made under the auspices of a congressional committee in 1960 reported the cost of a Nicaraguan lock-canal at over \$4 billion and a Nicaraguan sea-level canal completely impracticable.

The Atrato-Truando route in northwestern Colombia traverses perhaps the densest, most fetid jungle area in the Western Hemisphere and even for a high lock-canal would require the excavation of a vast gash in the formidable cordillera. A sea-level canal here would be unthinkable.

If another canal route in Panama is chosen—perhaps the San Blas Gulf route or the Caledonia Bay route—we can expect Panama to give us much less advantageous terms than in 1903. Then we were the wooed; now we are the suitor.

But have the possibilities of modernizing and enlarging the present Panama Canal been adequately considered? For this canal and all improvements in it within the present zone a full treaty basis exists or at least existed until President Johnson's announcement of September 24.

Many intelligent plans designed to modernize the present canal at minimal cost have been drawn up. The most feasible plan for enlarging the capacity of the canal within the present treaty arrangements provides for the continued maintenance of the lock principle. It would widen the single locks at the Caribbean end of the canal and the channel through the Culebra cut, would consolidate the dual system of locks at the Pacific end of the canal into a single set of locks, thus eliminating the awkward Pedro Miguel locks, and would provide an artificial terminal lake at the Pacific side of the isthmus comparable to the Gatun Lake at the Caribbean side.

This plan would speed up transit through the canal, would simplify maintenance, and would enlarge the service at much lower cost than under any of the alternative plans.

President Johnson's surrender of sovereignty over the present canal serves the Soviet objective of gaining control over the strategic waterways of the world, thus threatening the lifelines of the free nations, as illustrated, for example, in the experience of the Suez Canal, the Danube, the Dardanelles, and the straits of southeast Asia. Panama's attacks on the canal have significantly coincided with the challenges that Fidel Castro has hurled at the position of the United States in Guantanamo, guarding the eastward approach to the Panama Canal.

Issues of global importance are involved in the Panama conflict. It behooves the United States to understand these issues in their broadest and most sinister context and to take appropriate action.

Theodore Roosevelt proudly declared in 1910, speaking of the Panama Canal: "It is our canal; we built it; we fortified it, and we will protect it, and we will not permit our enemies to use it in war. In time of peace, all nations shall use it alike, but in time of war our interest at once becomes dominant." We are living now in such a time, and our own national interest in the Panama Canal should be the dominant consideration.

Representative WILLIAM HARSHA, Republican, of Ohio: "The U.S. Government has completely capitulated to the demands of Panama concerning the canal and we have come home from the so-called negotiations like a whipped pup with its tail between its legs. The country of Panama owes its entire existence to the United States and we have continually given friendship and economic support to it. * * * This Nation has paid Panama the full indemnity and an-

nities agreed upon by the two nations, has completely carried out the terms of the treaty and stands on firm moral and legal footing in this dispute, and under no circumstances should it have conceded to the Communist-inspired demands of Panama. How do we expect other nations to have any respect for the United States when we do not even have enough self-respect to stand firm when we are on solid, legal and moral footing?"

HEART DISEASE, CANCER, AND STROKE AMENDMENTS OF 1965, H.R. 3140

(Mr. FARBSTAIN (at the request of Mr. HOWARD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker, Congress has once again shown the leadership, of which it is so eminently capable, by passing into law the Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke Amendments of 1965. Congress has been a ground breaker in health care in the United States for many years and this bill confirms its foresighted outlook. I was glad to lend my personal support to the measure.

This bill goes a long way toward facilitating the modernization of that medical practice which is directed toward heart disease, stroke, cancer, and related diseases. For some time we have recognized that in many instances even when the facilities for the treatment of these diseases have been in existence, they have been so spread out, so disorganized, that best use of them was impossible. This measure makes it possible to establish programs of cooperation between medical schools, clinical research institutions, and hospitals. These arrangements, made by doctors and their institutions at the local level, will permit the interchange of personnel and patients and provide for a more effective flow of information about the latest advances in diagnosis and treatment. The experimental work that has proceeded this measure has proven beyond dispute the value of such cooperation, both to patients and to practitioners. Congress, I believe, is to be commended for taking such a progressive step to improve the treatment available to the victims of these dread diseases.

CLEAN AIR BILL, S. 306

(Mr. FARBSTAIN (at the request of Mr. HOWARD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note the overwhelming approval by the House of the Clean Air and Solid Waste Disposal Act, a measure of great importance to the Nation and of particular importance to my constituents in New York City. This bill, which is soon to become law, represents a giant step in the direction of full recognition by Congress that the problems of the city are the problems of every American. The quality of life in the United States has

Emilio Naranjo, of New Mexico, to be U.S. marshal, district of New Mexico, term of 4 years, vice Dave Fresquez, retired.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, October 14, 1965, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATIONS OF FREDERICK LANDIS, OF INDIANA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE U.S. CUSTOMS COURT

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, October 14, 1965, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Frederick Landis, of Indiana, to be a judge of the U.S. Customs Court.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], and myself, as chairman.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. CHURCH:

Address delivered by him entitled "The Education Decade in America."

Article entitled "Colorado Football's Galloping Disaster—Memoirs of a Big Coach," written by Bud Davis and published in Harper's magazine.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

News article in the October 6, 1965, Martinsburg (W. Va.) Journal, which reports on the recent meeting of the board of directors of the Corning Glass Works.

IMMIGRATION ACT

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, now that the Immigration Act has been signed by the President and the furor surrounding it has subsided, I believe it is appropriate to attempt to place this historic legislation in its proper perspective.

In the course of the several months of hearings and floor debate during which time the bill was fashioned, many misconceptions and exaggerations of the probable consequences of enactment were disseminated by many of the proponents and opponents. This is true not only of the bill itself, but also of my amendment to it which would place a ceiling on immigration from the Western Hemisphere.

The following points should be emphasized:

First. The act does abolish the national origins quota system, a fact which I regret; but it also does not necessarily have the effect of changing our historic population pattern.

Second. The act does not open the floodgates. On the contrary, it restricts immigration to those who have families already in the United States and to those who can contribute to the culture and economy of our country.

Third. My amendment will not reduce immigration from the Western Hemisphere. Rather it will stabilize hemispheric immigration to a maximum of its present rate or slightly above.

Fourth. My amendment does not discriminate against our neighbors in this hemisphere. As a matter of fact, they will receive a maximum quota far out of proportion to their share of the world's population. However, it does have the effect of eliminating, to a large extent, our historic discrimination which favors the nations of the Western Hemisphere as against all the rest of the nations of the world.

Mr. President, in order to make these matters clear, I ask unanimous consent that the following articles and editorials be printed at this point in the RECORD:

"The End of Quotas," an editorial from the October 1, 1965, edition of the Washington Star; "ERVIN Takes Lone Immigration Stand," an article by James K. Batten from the September 23, 1965, edition of the Charlotte Observer; "Immigration Bill Backed by ERVIN," an article by the Washington bureau of the Winston-Salem Journal appearing in that newspaper on September 23, 1965; "Immigration Curbs Indicated," an article by Richard L. Strout from the Christian Science Monitor of September 20, 1965; "ERVIN Makes Constructive Choice," an editorial from the Durham Morning Herald of September 27, 1965; and "An Historic Liberalization," an editorial from the Greensboro Daily News of September 26, 1965.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Oct. 1, 1965]

THE END OF QUOTAS

There are several things that the new immigration bill is not. It is not a special kind of civil rights bill, as Senator SPENCER HOLLAND seems to believe. Nor is it the startling liberal innovation that Senator ROBERT KENNEDY has made it appear.

Commonsense, nothing more or less, impels the Nation to set up an immigration law based on family relationships and personal skills rather than national origins. There is nothing radical about this. Indeed, the only radicalism attending Senate passage of the measure was the spectacle of Senators HOLLAND and KENNEDY reaffirming their personal views on racial equality—something neither man really had to do.

Aside from this exchange, however, some pertinent things were said about the bill itself—both by Senator SAM ERVIN and the bill's manager, Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts—that give it the luster of practicality.

Immigrant preference would go first to close relatives of American citizens. Secondary preference would be given to skilled individuals whose talents are needed in the American labor market. Some unskilled la-

borers and refugees would be admitted under the new system. But the ceiling on all immigration practically guarantees that the United States will never become a depot for a flood of undesirables.

More controversial is the provision imposing a special ceiling on immigration from our own hemisphere. But, again, the provision is more equitable than it seems. The numerical restriction on Latin and Canadian immigrants is only 50,000 less per year than restrictions on the rest of the world. The bill actually favors New World immigrants, but not so much that Latin America's population explosion will bring great waves of immigrants to our shores.

This is not a flawless piece of legislation. Some provisions, particularly those dealing with the reuniting of families according to closeness of kin, are confusing. But, as Senator ERVIN expressed it, the bill does not open the floodgates. The abolition of impersonal restrictions (as expressed in the quota system) is paired with the tightening of personal restrictions. And the result, which President Johnson plans to sign into law on Sunday, is about the best bill obtainable.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer, Sept. 23, 1965]

ERVIN TAKES LONE IMMIGRATION STAND (By James K. Batten)

WASHINGTON.—Senator SAM J. ERVIN, JR., found himself stuck out in the cold with his principles Wednesday as the Senate approved a significant new immigration program that he had helped fashion.

The vote was 76 to 18, but 14 of the nay-sayers were southerners. His North Carolina colleague, B. EVERETT JORDAN, was among them, as were the two South Carolinians, DONALD S. RUSSELL and STROM THURMOND.

ERVIN, who has established himself in the Senate as something of an expert on immigration, admitted after Wednesday's vote that he felt a little lonely.

"But I was the only southerner who went to the subcommittee hearings and tried to do something about the bill while the battle was on," he said.

During those hearings and afterward, ERVIN managed to win acceptance for a limitation of 120,000 immigrants a year from the Western Hemisphere—the first such limitation on immigration from the Americas in the Nation's history.

Like the southerners who voted against the bill, ERVIN wanted to retain the old national origins quota system, which favored immigration from the countries of Western Europe that helped populate America in the first place.

But from the beginning, it was clear that the national origins system was doomed this year.

The bill would abolish the controversial national origins system but restrict for the first time immigration from Latin America and Canada. A fight is expected in a conference over the restriction, a move rejected in the House.

The Senate bill provides an annual quota of 170,000, an increase of 11,439, for non-Western Hemisphere immigrants, with no more than 20,000 from any single nation.

It sets a ceiling of 120,000 a year for Western Hemisphere nations, an overall total with no country-by-country limitation.

In last Friday's debate, ERVIN explained to his colleagues that two possible courses of action had presented themselves:

"The first was that I might concentrate my efforts in a forlorn fight to preserve the national origins quota system and suffer defeat in such fight without rendering any service to my country, other than that of loyalty to an ideal which I cherished.

"The second possible course of action which confronted me was to join with other mem-

bers of the subcommittee in an effort to present to the Senate the best possible obtainable immigration law, curing the defects of the present law, without the retention of the national origins quota system.

"I felt that I could serve my country best by adopting the second alternative."

In working for the "best possible obtainable" law, ERVIN overcame efforts by the administration, particularly the State Department, to defeat his limitation on Western Hemisphere immigration.

The State Department argued that to impose such a ceiling would damage U.S. relations with Latin America. The Senate was urged to recognize the Nation's "special relationship" with its Western Hemisphere neighbors.

But ERVIN's rebuttal helped convince the Senate to impose the ceiling anyway.

"I submit that there is no relationship," ERVIN said, "which is closer or more 'special' than that which our country bears to England, our great ally that gave us our language, our law, and much of our literature."

"Yet under this bill my friends express no shock that Britain in the future can send us 10,000 fewer immigrants than she has sent on an annual average in the past."

"They are only shocked that British Guiana cannot send us every single citizen of that country who wishes to come."

As the debate wound to a close Wednesday, ERVIN was showered with tributes from the supporters of immigration reform.

Senator TED KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, the bill's floor manager, extended his "great appreciation and admiration for the Senator from North Carolina . . . it is a better bill because of his contributions."

ERVIN admitted that his vote Wednesday might not be popular in North Carolina. "They probably won't like it," he said, recalling that his mail had run strongly against the pending bill.

But critical citizens who responded to his letters of explanation, ERVIN added, uniformly backed his stand.

[From the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Journal, Sept. 23, 1965]

IMMIGRANT BILL BACKED BY ERVIN

WASHINGTON.—Senator SAM ERVIN came reluctantly to support of the immigration bill which the Senate passed yesterday, but in the end the Senator from North Carolina was one of the foremost supporters of the bill on the Senate floor.

The main purpose of the bill is to eliminate the national origins quota system which for many years has been the foundation of the Nation's immigration policy but which four Presidents have condemned as an embarrassment to the Nation before the world.

Senator ERVIN called himself yesterday "a great believer in the wisdom of the national origins quota system."

He has favored continuing the system, he said, and "frankly, I would still oppose its abolition if I had any hope of success."

SUPPORTS BILL

But he nevertheless voted for the bill as it passed, 76 to 18. Only five southerners joined him—Senators FULBRIGHT of Arkansas, SMATHERS of Florida, LONG of Louisiana, and GORE and BASS, both of Tennessee. All are Democrats.

Fourteen other southerners voted against the bill. They included Senator EVERETT JORDAN, Democrat, of North Carolina.

The Presidents who opposed the national origins quotas, and most of the Senators who voted to end the quotas system yesterday, object to the way the system has discriminated against immigrants from such areas as southern Europe and the Orient.

TWO COURSES

ERVIN said he saw nothing unjust in the system, but that it had become outdated

because of exceptions to it, including special refugee laws. ERVIN said his realization that the quotas system would be eliminated by Congress left him a problem—and "two possible courses of action."

He explained:

"The first was that I might concentrate my efforts in a forlorn fight to preserve the national origins quota system and suffer defeat in such fight without rendering any service to my country other than that of loyalty to an ideal which I cherished."

"The second possible course of action . . . was to join in an effort to present to the Senate the best possible obtainable immigration law, curing the defects of present law without the retention of the national origins quota system."

HELPED REWRITING

"I felt that I could serve my country best by adopting the second alternative."

So several months ago ERVIN began working, within the Senate Judiciary Committee, to help rewrite the immigration proposal offered by the administration.

The result, ERVIN said yesterday, is "a good measure. . . . It is designed to restrict immigration to near relatives of those who are already in the United States . . . and to those persons who have something to contribute to the economic and cultural development of the United States."

ERVIN's foremost victory in the drafting of the bill was the insertion of an amendment limiting the number of immigrants the United States will accept from other nations of this hemisphere.

OPPOSED PLAN

The State Department opposed such a provision, even though Secretary of State Dean Rusk did agree that at some point, given a continuation of Latin America's population explosion, a limitation would have to be set.

Several days ago, after many private meetings involving administration officials, ERVIN, and other Senators, it was agreed that the ERVIN amendment would be inserted in the bill and would stand without challenge by the administration on the Senate floor.

Senator EDWARD KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, the floor manager of the bill, was among the last to give in to the agreement.

But yesterday, KENNEDY praised ERVIN for his cooperation, and so, too, did Senator PHILIP HART, of Michigan, original sponsor of the bill. ERVIN had been "magnificent" in his work on the bill, HART said.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 20, 1965]

IMMIGRATION CURBS INDICATED

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—Over the opposition of the Johnson administration, the Senate apparently is headed toward applying immigration restrictions to the Western Hemisphere, including Canada and Mexico.

The House approved such a provision by a teller vote, but later narrowly defeated it on a rollcall. The Senate now has the House bill.

Latin America has the fastest growing population on earth. It would be unfair, some Senators argue, to reduce immigration from the United Kingdom by one-third, as the proposed system requires, while continuing unlimited immigration from Latin America.

The proposed bill kills the 41-year-old national origins system and substitutes a new formula which its sponsors call nondiscriminatory.

RESULT IN DOUBT

As first written, however, it discriminated against the rest of the world to the advantage of the Western Hemisphere, for it was only here that no numerical limits applied.

The State Department opposes restrictions on Latin America, arguing that the latter has a special relationship. President Johnson supports the stand. The strength of House-Senate opposition to the big loophole apparently has surprised the administration. The result is still in doubt and could be decided in conference.

In any case, immediate restrictions on Canada would not be applied. There will be a 3-year waiting period while Western Hemisphere immigration is studied by a commission of demographers.

Ultimately, under the plan, a ceiling of 120,000 immigrants would be applied to the entire Western Hemisphere, exclusive of parents, spouses, and children, to take effect July 1, 1968. How this total would be divided among Canada, Mexico, and other western nations is undecided.

RESTRICTION DEMANDED

Restriction on the Western Hemisphere is the condition on which Senator SAM J. ERVIN Jr., Democrat, of North Carolina, bases his support for the pending measure.

Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, sponsor of the compromise bill has reluctantly accepted it.

Mr. ERVIN rejects the argument that Latin America requires a special relationship. "I submit that there is no relationship," he said, "which is closer or more 'special' than that which our country bears to England, our great ally that gave us our language, our law, and much of our literature."

"Yet under this bill my friends express no shock that Britain in the future can send us 10,000 fewer immigrants than she has sent on an annual average in the past. They are only shocked that British Guiana cannot send us every single citizen of that country who wishes to come."

The old national origins system of quotas has, in fact, broken down. Only about a third of present immigration enters under it. The big loopholes are immigration from the Western Hemisphere, refugees, and special "hardship" cases advanced in thousands by Congress.

INCREASE OF 80,000

The population of the United States increases annually, without immigration, about 3 million a year. Unemployment has averaged around 5 percent for some years. The new bill would ultimately allow an estimated 355,000 immigrants a year, though some place it much higher. This is about 60,000 more than the present immigration.

The new total would break down as follows: 170,000 given to the world exclusive of the Western Hemisphere. This would be allocated at no more than 20,000 to a country on a first come first served basis.

Thus England, which has been sending 30,000 immigrants a year, would be cut to 20,000.

Next, some 60,000 "immediate relatives" would be admitted to reunite immigrants with families left behind. Finally, a proposed ceiling of 120,000 would go to the Western Hemisphere, plus a category of "immediate relatives." Mr. Kennedy thinks this would add up to around 355,000.

BILLS ADMIT THOUSANDS

Such figures however are theoretical. Individual Congressmen are eager to aid constituents by passing special legislation for "hardship cases." These amount to thousands annually.

Senator ERVIN stresses the need of controlling Latin American immigration which, he argues, threatens to "double" every year. It has increased 400 percent in the past 10 years, he says.

Canada is feeling the drain of highly trained professional people, he says. "For every professional person who migrates to Canada," he says, "two leave."

Asiatic exclusion was a red-hot issue in the 1870's and 1880's. Congress first bar-

October 7, 1965

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000100040001-6

25275

red Chinese laborers in 1882. Sponsors of the pending bill argue that they are dropping anti-Asiatic discrimination. Actually, it is likely to be carried forward administratively, rather than by the much-criticized quotas.

[From the Durham (N.C.) Morning Herald, Sept. 27, 1965]

ERVIN MAKES CONSTRUCTIVE CHOICE

Senator ERVIN made a choice on the immigration bill that southern Senators and Congressmen have traditionally resisted.

He saw two alternatives: All-out negative opposition to a measure he opposed or grudging support given in return for revisions reflecting his views and those of his constituents.

Southerners have faced these alternatives for years, especially in civil rights issues. Repeatedly they have chosen bitter end opposition. They have wasted their time and talents in a resistance for resistance's sake that has produced nothing except personal political advantages among their own electorates.

There are, of course, important issues that leave a Senator or Representative no choice except to go down to total defeat with all flags flying. But the number of such issues is small. And the leather lunged cries of "never" by bitter-enders in the Congress have more often than not simply made defeat for the views of their constituents total as well as inevitable.

Senator ERVIN's objections to the immigration bill were undoubtedly shared by a majority of North Carolinians. Some of his technical objections eventually were shared by advocates of the bill from other States. It would have been easy for Senator ERVIN to do as other southern opponents did, to shout his undying opposition to the bill and store up yet another issue to show the folks back home how he had carried on for them against unnamed forces of evil.

Instead, the Senator chose to try to modify what he felt was objectionable. And having won modification, he recognized his responsibility to show by his vote that the final Senate version of the bill reflected views he represents.

This approach can be hard to explain on the stump back home. It offers none of the stem winding possibilities so long utilized by the professional veterans of lost causes.

But there is no question of whether Senator ERVIN or the nay sayers served their States best in the case of the immigration bill. They added to their personal records. He added to a law.

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News, Sept. 26, 1965]

A HISTORIC LIBERALIZATION

Reform of America's archaic immigration laws now appears certain. Both House and Senate have passed bills that would abolish the 41-year-old national origins quota system, replacing it with equitable standards for the admission of immigrants; the House-Senate conference will be under heavy pressure from President Johnson to draw up a compromise measure as quickly as possible.

The 1924 law is patently discriminatory. Though it places no restrictions on immigration from Canada and Latin America, it imposes a limit of 150,000 immigrants each year on the rest of the world. Each country is assigned a quota, now based on the ratio to 150,000 of the number of persons of that national origin in the 1920 census. Thus, for example, the United Kingdom has regularly been assigned a quota of about 65,000; it corresponds to the 1920 census, in which 45 million of the 105 million Americans had British origins.

That figure alone reveals the intent of the bill: in 1920 the population of the United States was predominantly northern European in origin, and Congress wanted to keep it that way. The purpose of the bill was to restrict immigration from southern Europe and Asia by basing the quotas for those areas on their relatively small representation in 1920 census.

Thus Italy has had an annual quota of approximately 5,600; Greece, 300; Hungary, 900. In each of these instances and others, thousands of potential immigrants have been turned away—many of them seeking to join their families in the United States, others possessing valuable skills and talents. At the same time Great Britain has never met its quota; the closest it came was in 1946, when 33,552 Britons immigrated to the United States.

The inequity of this law—and its implied insult to the low-quota nations—has long been apparent. President Kennedy, the grandson of Irish immigrants, recognized the problem and outlined it in a small, posthumous book, "A Nation of Immigrants." The bill now on the verge of final passage was proposed during his administration, then endorsed and introduced by President Johnson.

In its House version, the bill conforms closely to the Johnson proposal. It continues unrestricted immigration from Canada and Latin America, and sets a maximum of 170,000 a year from the rest of the world. No country would be allowed more than 20,000 immigrants a year; that is, the sole limitation on nationality. Instead of gaining entry on the basis of the happenstance of his birthplace, a potential immigrant would have to convince U.S. authorities that he would be a valuable citizen. Close relatives of American citizens would be admitted without numerical restriction.

The Senate bill includes all these provisions and one other; it restricts Western Hemisphere immigration to 120,000 a year. That restriction is the creation of Senator SAM ERVIN, one of the few Southern Senators to vote for the bill; he argues that there is no "special relationship" between the United States and Latin America or Canada that surpasses the "special relationship" with Great Britain, and that therefore special privileges for Latin Americans or Canadians are unjustified.

Despite the justifiable concern of the State Department over the potential political impact of this provision, the arguments against it are not on balance convincing. If immigration should not be determined by national origins, why should it be determined by foreign policy or vague assertions of "special relationships"? Complete fairness demands that all be treated alike; whether 120,000 is too low or too high can be debated, but establishing a maximum does not seem unreasonable.

The Western Hemisphere restriction is far less important, however, than the broad and historic liberalization of American immigration law. Whatever compromise is finally approved, if it includes the basic elements of the Johnson proposal it will be welcome.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Banking and Currency Committee be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, with great reluctance, I feel that I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

DEACTIVATION OF SIX RESERVE DIVISIONS AND OTHER UNITS OF THE ARMY RESERVE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, is the Senate still transacting routine morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have an extraneous matter, not on the subject pending, and if no other Senator has anything in the nature of morning business, I ask unanimous consent, when other Senators have completed their morning business, that I be allowed to proceed for 18 minutes to present this matter, and that it not count as one of my appearances on the motion to take up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will not count as a speech.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it not count as one of my appearances and that I be allowed to proceed for 18 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Mississippi is recognized for 18 minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have received many inquiries from Senators, as well as Representatives, and many citizens in the country at large, for information and comment with reference to the recent announcement of Secretary of Defense McNamara with reference to deactivating six Reserve divisions and other units of the Army Reserve.

As I was the one who acted as chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and also presented the bill on the floor of the Senate, which bill then went on to conference, where I was a conferee, I have a special responsibility, I believe, to the Senate on that subject, and I propose at this time to give a factual statement with reference to the entire matter which has been before Congress for the entire calendar year.

In a news conference last Thursday, September 30, the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, announced the disbanding of 750 Army Reserve units. After stating that Deputy Secretary of Defense Vance had appeared before a House Armed Services Subcommittee that morning and discussed the plan—meaning the plan to reduce the Reserves—Mr. McNamara said:

I think it is fair to say that they look with favor upon it.

Later in the same news conference, Mr. McNamara was asked questions and gave answers as follows:

Question. Mr. Secretary, did you get as favorable a response in the Senate to this plan that you apparently got in the Hébert committee this morning?

Secretary McNAMARA. Well, we haven't met with committees of the Senate in quite the same way as we did with the Hébert committee this morning, but those Members of the Senate with whom we have discussed it, I think, have responded as favorably as did

Members of the House. Cy, is that a fair appraisal, do you think?

Question. That presumably includes Senator STENNIS?

Secretary McNAMARA. I don't want to speak for individual members of the committee. I would rather you talk to him directly. Let me simply say we have talked to Members of the Senate, leaders of the Senate, in the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees and they have received the plan favorably. But I don't want to speak for any particular one of them. I think each of them might put some particular interpretation on his own appraisal of it and you should get it from him.

I do not know just whom Secretary McNamara intended to include as "leaders of the Senate, in the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees," but I assume he refers to the Senate conferees on the Defense appropriations bill and the members of the Senate Armed Services Committee who held hearings on this Reserve-Guard merger question. This would include the following Senators: HAYDEN, RUSSELL, HILL, ELLENDER, McCLELLAN, STENNIS, SALTONSTALL, YOUNG of North Dakota, SMITH, BYRD of Virginia, SYMINGTON, JACKSON, and THURMOND.

To ascertain the correctness of the Secretary's statement that the "leaders of the Senate, in the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees have received the plan favorably," I have personally talked with each of these Senators about the matter.

As to Senators HAYDEN, HILL, ELLENDER, McCLELLAN, YOUNG of North Dakota, SMITH, BYRD of Virginia, SYMINGTON, JACKSON, and THURMOND, I find that neither Secretary McNamara nor Deputy Secretary Vance, nor anyone for them, has ever mentioned this plan announced on September 30 to any of them in any form; that these Senators have not approved the plan, nor received it with favor; and, in fact, that these Senators had not heard of the plan until Secretary McNamara announced it last Thursday.

The remaining Senators of the group are Senators RUSSELL, SALTONSTALL, and STENNIS.

I have learned from Senator RUSSELL that he was seen by Secretary Vance and this plan regarding the Army Reserves was discussed, along with other matters, but was not fully broken down or fully explained. Senator RUSSELL tells me he did not approve the plan, nor did he "receive the plan favorably" in any way. Senator RUSSELL has authorized me to repeat our conversation to this effect.

Senator SALTONSTALL was also visited by Mr. Vance, but he tells me that he neither approved the plan, nor "received the plan favorably." Instead, Senator SALTONSTALL advised Mr. Vance to seek legislation if Mr. McNamara were still pursuing the merger idea, and to "put the bill in at this session." Senator SALTONSTALL has authorized me to quote him to this effect.

I hope it will be understood that I was merely interrogating on the idea whether these Senators had received the plan favorably, as Mr. McNamara reported.

That leaves Senator STENNIS.

Mr. Vance came to my office and discussed this matter about a week before

Secretary McNamara's announcement. Secretary Vance's primary emphasis was on the problem of training new men, but he discussed the plan to some degree. Mr. Vance had no written explanation of this plan, but he did have a single sheet of paper with a column of figures thereon which related altogether to training loads and did not describe this plan as to the Reserve; this paper is classified or I would print it in the RECORD. Mr. Vance mentioned the fact that they proposed to deactivate some of the low priority Reserve units. He made reference to several Reserve divisions. But certainly he did not at all make it clear in his discussion with me that they proposed to deactivate 55,000 men in the Army Reserve, or that six entire divisions were to be swept out. If he mentioned the figure "55,000," I thought it was related in some way to the overall training program for all new men, including the 240,000 new men for the Army. Had such a proposal to deactivate 55,000 spaces in present Army Reserve units, or to take out six divisions, been clearly made I would have vigorously challenged him instantly and on the spot as proposing something far out of line from what is permitted in good faith by the language of the appropriations bill and far beyond what the conference understood.

I did tell Mr. Vance that the Senate conferees had in mind that under the language used, they would have some discretion to cancel out some of the so-called low priority Army Reserve units because the language did not require the full number of 270,000 men for the Army Reserves at all times. However, in the same breath I told Mr. Vance, with emphasis, that the Senate conferees certainly expected Secretary McNamara to live up to the full spirit and letter of the language of the appropriations bill which called for a planned strength of 270,000 men in the Army Reserves and that this number should be there on June 30, 1966. I emphasized this requirement and Mr. Vance did not dissent.

Mr. Vance did not ask me to approve the plan. Nor did he suggest that I do so. Nor did he suggest that I "look with favor on it." Had he asked for my approval or suggested that I "look with favor on it," this would have sharply focused my attention and I would have immediately called for a full explanation in writing, of just what the proposal was, as I had done prior to the Senate-House conference on the appropriation bill in regard to the so-called 17-State plan then proposed before the conferees.

I have dealt with this matter. When there was talk a month ago about a 17-State plan when this matter was to come before the Senate-House conference, I declined to discuss that 17-State plan until a full outline had been put in writing by the Department of Defense. I wanted to know exactly what they would do and not do. One reason for that is that it is a very complicated matter. It is never easy for me to understand these complicated tables of organization. I got lost very readily, and still do, when they talk about a military personnel plan that involves many small,

medium, and large military units. In any event, whenever there has been proposed what I understand is a real plan, I have required that it be put in writing, with numbers and figures, so we can all understand it.

Had this new plan or proposal thus been fully set forth, I would have seen immediately its full import and vigorously objected because it is not in keeping with the spirit of the appropriation bill and is a long step on the merger plan which was expressly rejected by the conferences on the Defense appropriations bill.

I refer now to a brief quotation on that point from the conference report itself, as filed with the House of Representatives on this very appropriation bill, with the express wording contained in that appropriation bill and with the comment on the Army Reserve.

Page 3 of the conference report refers to what was done and concludes as follows:

It should be clear from this action that the realignment or reorganization of the Army Reserve components can be effected only through the enactment of appropriate law.

I wish to make clear that I am not suggesting that Mr. Vance acted in bad faith in any way. In our discussion at my office, I feel he acted in good faith. He did entirely fail, unintentionally, to make it clear that they planned a reduction in the Army Reserve units of anything like the proportions Mr. McNamara announced. My firm position that they, of course, would keep the strength up should have made my position fully clear to him.

Mr. McNamara has a responsibility, of course, regarding the Army Reserve program. He was fully within his rights and was discharging his responsibility in urging the Congress to merge the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard. The Congress heard and fully considered his testimony and refused to allow him to make the merger. This decision was the responsibility of the Congress. Now, it is clearly the Secretary's responsibility to take the law as enacted by the Congress to apply for fiscal year 1966, and to operate in good faith within the spirit and the letter of that law, the Defense appropriation bill.

Two sides can argue about the possibilities of the legal meaning of the word, but no one can deny the spirit and good faith of the entire matter all the way through.

This bill, recently enacted, absolutely forbids the Secretary from transferring funds from the Army National Guard to the Army Reserve account, or vice versa. This law requires him to keep the Army National Guard up to a minimum of 380,000. This same law gives him a small measure of discretion as to the Army Reserve in that the language of the law does not require him to keep the total of the Reserves up to 270,000 all the time—but it does demand a planned end strength in good faith that will bring a total of 270,000 Reserves at the end of fiscal year 1966.

Instead of a reasonable, modest move that would live up to this requirement,

October 6, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

25255

Answer. The answer to this question is, "No."

It is not intended to have a maximum penalty of 20 percent. The only place in the legislative history where this is suggested is in the minority views of the House committee report.

The Secretary of Commerce has confirmed that it is his interpretation and intention that the maximum penalty which would be applied against a State would be 10 percent for any one apportionment, whether the State in question had failed to achieve control on billboards or junkyards or both.

This part can be clarified in the further legislative history on this bill.

Question. Is it correct that this legislation will cause a waste of money by spending huge amounts on landscaping or scenic enhancement?

Answer. The answer to this question is clearly, "No."

This legislation provides that within the right-of-way the cost of landscaping and putting the right-of-way in decent and attractive condition is a part of the cost of construction. This is not a new law or a radical innovation. This is simply a restatement of what has been long established law.

With respect to scenic strips adjacent to the right-of-way, this legislation provides that the States will be allotted an amount equivalent to 3 percent of their highway apportionment, to be used in preserving or enhancing the scenic values of land adjacent to the rights-of-way.

This amount is not required to be matched by the States.

It does us little good to spend literally billions of dollars constructing magnificent paved highways and even landscaping the narrow strip of right-of-way, if some attention is not given to the land area adjacent to the rights-of-way. Where there are special scenic attractions, such as a wooded tract or a stream of a particularly striking view, appropriate action should be taken to preserve the natural beauty and attraction of those areas. Furthermore, more attention and more emphasis is needed in providing rest or recreational areas along our highways, and the limited extent to which this can be done within a narrow right-of-way is often insufficient.

This represents an investment for the future. This represents an economic investment for every State during the present and immediate future. By providing funds to clean up areas adjacent to the highways and to put them in decent condition, we are providing some opportunities for employment. We are providing the means whereby countless local areas throughout the Nation will present themselves in a far better light and will improve their economic situation, their economic standing by being able to attract more tourists and more travelers to their areas.

Question. Is this legislation premature because the Committee did not have sufficient information on which to base sound conclusions?

Answer. The answer to this question is clearly, "No."

The problem of billboard and junkyard control was called to the attention of the Congress in the President's message on natural beauty many months ago in February 1965.

The specific proposals for billboard and junkyard control were transmitted to the Congress for consideration last May.

Since then, the Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee has held extensive hearings and has heard many witnesses representing all points of view.

The record of hearings before the Subcommittee on Roads consists of 500 printed pages.

When the full committee acted on the subcommittee's recommendation, the full committee had not only the benefit of the House hearings but had the benefit of hearings which had been completed before the Senate committee and had the benefit of the discussion and action by the Senate on similar legislation.

The basic principles embodied in this legislation are not any different from the basic principles which were considered in similar legislation in 1958.

Of course, it can be argued that nobody can tell at this time the exact impact this legislation will have in each and every State. This is no more than a trite truism with respect to any proposed legislation.

Of course, no one can say in advance exactly how many billboards may turn out to be in controlled areas and therefore have to be removed in 1970, just as no one can say in advance how many billboards will actually be maintained in commercial or industrial areas.

It would be foolish to try to take an inventory of every single billboard in the country located on the interstate and primary systems and try to make a guess as to whether those billboards would be located in a commercial or industrial area, next year, in 1970, or in 1980.

The full impact of this legislation is clear. It is clear that the legislation is designed to prevent an unbridled proliferation of billboards and junkyards along our interstate and primary systems.

It is clear that this legislation is designed to screen junkyards which are within 1,000 feet of the right-of-way unless they are located in industrial areas.

It is clear that this legislation is designed to provide a reasonable degree of control of outdoor advertising in commercial or industrial areas.

It is clear that the details of regulations and sign criteria cannot now be spelled out because this is a subject which requires extensive consultation with the States and the affected industries and businesses, and in fact the legislation requires that public hearings be held in each of the 50 States.

This legislation is not premature; it does not need further extended study or procrastination or delay.

To delay action on this kind of legislation is simply to make the problem increasingly difficult, analogous to the delay in doing something about a polluted river or stream. We know that surely at some point a halt must be called and action must be taken. To wait until the situation grows from bad to worse is simply to make final action more expensive for both the Federal and State Governments and for the private business interests involved.

Question. Why not let the States do the job? Is this unnecessary centralization of power in the Federal Government?

Answer. For 7 years, since 1958, we have had the voluntary billboard bonus law. Under that law, the States which would agree to control billboard advertising on the Interstate System would be entitled to one-half of 1 percent bonus on the amounts the States receive for the Interstate System.

It has been clearly demonstrated that this law has been completely ineffective in obtaining a reasonable degree of control of billboards on the Interstate System, and therefore it is obvious that this method should not be continued and there is absolutely no point in trying to apply it to the primary system.

During these 7 years, only 25 States have finally entered into agreements to control billboard advertising along the Interstate System.

Since 1958, only approximately \$500,000 in bonus payments have been made for con-

trol of less than 200 miles of interstate highway. This is less than 1 percent of the interstate mileage already completed.

The highways of this Nation are public highways. They are public facilities. On a plain dollar and cents basis, the Federal Government has a very proper and legitimate interest in the Federal-aid interstate and primary systems.

With this great and substantial direct interest of the Federal Government, how can we expect 50 different State legislatures really to be concerned about this problem if the U.S. Congress is not concerned enough to enact adequate legislation.

This is not simply a job for the States. This is a job for both the Federal Government and the States following the partnership concept which has characterized our Federal-aid highway program from the beginning.

This is not a diabolical centralization of Federal authority, any more than such is the case with highway design standards, or the case with the Federal rules and regulations pertaining to rights-of-way, or the case with the Federal rules and regulations pertaining to the width of highways, or the required thickness of the concrete pavement.

(Mr. EDMONDSON (at the request of Mr. BINGHAM) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. EDMONDSON'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. BINGHAM) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. BINGHAM) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1965

(Mr. JACOBS (at the request of Mr. BINGHAM) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed a thrilling privilege last Sunday.

I stood near the President of the United States as he signed into law the Immigration Act recently passed by Congress.

Along with other Members of Congress and interested citizens, I watched this historic ceremony which fulfilled, beneath the shadow of the Statue of Liberty, an important part of the American dream.

The President's signature marked one of the finest accomplishments of the administration during this year.

It signaled the reform of our immigration laws by abolishing the discrim-

inatory national origins systems in favor of a system of selection designed to reunite families and admit persons with special skills which will be of positive benefit to our country.

Under the national origins system, the admission of a person to this country as a quota immigrant depended far more on the accident of where he was born than on his ability to contribute to our society, or on his relationship to a family in this country.

As a result, persons with no special talents to offer, and no family connections here, were often favored for admission in preference to those with high attainments or close family ties.

For instance, an American citizen could import a housemaid from northern Europe more easily than he could bring his own mother here, if she had been born in southern or eastern Europe.

The same situation confronted an American hospital with an urgent need for a medical specialist who was born in a low-quota country.

Besides being discriminatory, morally wrong, and hurtful to our own people, the national origins system was harmful in our foreign relations and out of harmony with the best in American traditions.

Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson had all urged that it be changed. This year, after thorough study and long hearings, Congress finally did so.

In place of the national origins system, the new law establishes a system of selection which will be fairer, more rational, more humane, and more in the national interest.

Under the new law, selection of qualified applicants will be based on six preference categories which reflect family ties and personal skills.

For immigrants within the same preference category, the rule will be first come, first served.

This system of selection will apply to all immigration that was formerly subject to national quotas. Such immigration will be fixed at 170,000 a year, with a further limit of 20,000 for any one country.

Immigration from Western Hemisphere countries will be subject to a separate limitation of 120,000 a year beginning in 1968.

The new law makes no basic changes in the safeguards of our immigration laws against subversive, criminal, illiterate, or other undesirable immigrants.

However, in line with the objective of reuniting families, certain close relatives who were absolutely excluded because of mental retardation or a past history of mental illness can be allowed to join their families if such afflicted persons are not dangerous and if proper guarantees are given for their future care.

The new law will not open the gates to unlimited or excessive immigration. It will not change the "public charge" test which excludes immigrants who are candidates for the welfare rolls.

And the safeguards against immigrants who might diminish the job opportunities of American workers have been considerably strengthened.

The conclusion is plain. The new immigration law is a long overdue reform that will reunite families. It will restore our reputation for judging people on personal merit and not by where they come from. And, it will generally strengthen us as a nation.

GERMAN AMERICAN DAY

(Mr. HANLEY (at the request of Mr. BINGHAM) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, after 2½ months of traversing the Atlantic Ocean, the ship *Concord* arrived near Philadelphia, Pa., on October 6, 1683. Thirteen German-Quaker families wearily debarked and looked out over the land which offered them a new life of freedom. Under the leadership of Franz Daniel Pastorius, these first German families established the primary permanent settlement of an entirely German group in the New World. Thus, October 6, 1683, marked the beginning of an exciting German history in America.

Five years after the arrival of the *Concord*, the settlers of Germantown, Pa., drew up the first protest ever voiced against Negro slavery in America. This protest was authored by Franc Pastorius, a noted German scholar and linguist, and signed by three townsmen.

As we mark the 282d anniversary of the arrival of the German sector of our society, it is appropriate to elaborate on a few of the numerous contributions made to America by these first German families and subsequent German settlers and their progeny.

German contributions began long before the *Concord* reached Philadelphia. In 1507, Martin Waldseemüller suggested in his book "Cosmographie Introductio," that the New World be called America. Over 100 years later, America was a word spoken in many countries by persons desirous of an opportunity to begin their lives in the atmosphere of freedom. These persons had a spirit of adventure—the adventure of liberty.

These contributions began when the first Germans debarked upon our shores and have continued to the present day. They have been made in every area of human endeavor.

Jacob Leisler, an early Governor of New York, called together the first Congress on American soil. He was convinced that New York and the colonies were threatened with an invasion by the French and Indians. Thus on May 1, 1690, he called the Congress consisting of the Governors of Massachusetts, Plymouth, East and West Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia. This gathering was the progenitor of the Continental Congress and later the Congress as it is known today.

While the colonists in the West were fighting Indians and the colonists in Pennsylvania were teaching the Indians the highest ideals of Christianity, Dr. Hans Kierstedt opened his practice of medicine in New York.

During the American Revolution, George Washington depended solely on

a German-American regiment of bodyguards lead by Maj. Bartholomaeus von Heer. Behind the valiant German soldiers fighting for our freedom were their wives and sweethearts. Among the more famous were Molly Pitcher and Emily Guyer. These women carried valuable American dispatches through British lines. This type of valor contributed greatly toward our independence.

It was the Germans who helped preserve President Abraham Lincoln's ideas of unity. One of the more prominent figures was a Wisconsin lawyer, Carl Schurz, who attacked the Fugitive Slave Law. Mr. Schurz later was named the Secretary of the Interior—1877–1881. He was one of the first of the many to try to enact laws to protect our forests and woodlands. Among his other accomplishments was his application of Civil Service reforms in his department. Among his principles were: no removals except for cause; if force should be reduced, least competent would go first; no promotions were to be made except for merit; if there were no vacancies, no recommendations for office would be entertained. He also established a board of inquiry.

Another lawyer, William Wirt, became the prosecuting attorney at the trial of Aaron Burr. Mr. Wirt's speech has important rank in American oratorical literature.

The political profile of the New York State Senator Otto G. Foelker occupies an important chapter of political history. Senator Foelker was a member of the New York State Senate at the time when the controversial question of race-track gambling was being discussed. The legislature was equally divided on this issue. However, when it was finally brought to a vote, Senator Foelker, critically ill, demanded that he be carried to the senate floor to vote against race-track gambling. He cast his vote and the bill prohibiting gambling, was passed by a vote of 26–25.

Germans were the first nationality group to vote independently of party. Peter Zenger founded the first independent political newspaper in New York. Germans were active in the fields of personal liberty and temperance. They have also played an important role in our educational system. Two significant contributions are kindergarten and the introduction of the idea that subjects should be taught in such a way as to relate to other subjects the student is learning.

Names of German origin have been sprinkled throughout our history. In the field of science, names include Albert Einstein, Albert A. Michelson, David Rittenhouse, H. E. Muhlenberg, Werner Van Braun, and John A. Roebling. Familiar names in the arts include George Benjamin Luks, paintings include "Woman With a Black Cat," "Boy With the Guitar," "The Old Bus Driver"; Emanuel Leutz, paintings include "Washington Crossing the Delaware," and "Westward the Course of Empire Takes Its Way," which panels the staircase of our Nation's Capitol; Carl Marr, "The Adoration of Christ Child." Gottlieb Graupner is known as the "Father of the American

cultural development than Pulaski's Polish kinsmen. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, America can appropriately use the day commemorating the death of Casimir Pulaski to pay well deserved tribute to those of Polish birth of blood who, generation after generation, have done so much in behalf of this country.

NEW IMMIGRATION ACT A STEP FORWARD IN ELIMINATING DISCRIMINATION FROM AMERICAN LIFE

(Mr. CONYERS (at the request of Mr. BINGHAM) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, after more than 40 years of discrimination and hardships, there has finally been erased from the statute books of the United States the notorious—and to some people, the infamous—national origins quota system. During all of that time, admissibility to the United States was determined not merely on a basis of personal quality and acceptability of the prospective immigrant, but, more important, upon the basis of the particular country where he was born. Because of the quota system, which made visas available subject to a numerical limitation according to the national origin of our 1920 population, three countries had more than two-thirds of the total number of visas, while all the other countries of the world, numbering more than 100, shared the balance.

Naturally, this led to hardship for many of our own citizens and resident aliens who were deprived of the privilege of bringing to this country their loved ones. Similarly, prospective employers in this country were deprived of the opportunity of bringing here specially skilled and trained persons whose services were urgently needed, but who were unable to obtain an immigrant visa because the quota of their native country was oversubscribed.

The national origins system produced ridiculous situations. For example, a person in the United States was able to bring to this country a domestic servant from Great Britain, but was unable to obtain the entry of his aged mother from Greece, because the Greek quota was oversubscribed while the British quota had ample visas available to all who sought them.

Under the new law which was enacted October 3, the present quota system will be totally abolished effective July 1, 1968. Until that time, and thereafter, there will be a worldwide limitation of 170,000 upon immigration from the Eastern Hemisphere. Until then, countries will continue to be entitled to the number of visas authorized under the existing quota system. But leftover visas, remaining unused because there is no demand in certain countries, are to be assigned to a pool to be distributed to immigrants from those countries whose quotas are oversubscribed.

On July 1, 1968, the new system of distribution of immigrant visas to persons from Eastern Hemisphere countries will be completely effective. Immigrant visas

will be assigned strictly on a system of preferences based upon relationship to U.S. citizens and lawfully resident aliens, and upon the particular skills and abilities of prospective immigrant to perform needed services and labor in the United States. Within each preference category, the rule will be first-come, first-served. No country may be assigned more than 20,000 visas in any single year. All references to race or national origin are removed from the law. With the effective date of this law, the United States again demonstrates to the world its firm conviction that there shall be no discrimination or prejudice in this country, that persons shall be judged upon the basis of their individual merit, and that liberty, equality, and freedom can be enduring realities in this country.

For the first time in the history of the United States, there has been incorporated in the permanent immigration law a specific provision for assignment of a number of visas to refugees, on a preference basis. This again establishes our historic policy of granting refuge to those who have been forced to flee from their homelands because of persecution or natural calamity.

The new immigration law provides that commencing July 1, 1968, there shall be a ceiling of 120,000 annually on Western Hemisphere immigration. Of course, that number is exclusive of the immediate family members of U.S. citizens—meaning their spouses, parents, and children, who are not subject to the numerical limitation. As a precautionary measure, the law provides for a Commission to study the entire matter of immigration from the Western Hemisphere and to submit a report prior to the effective date of the ceiling so that Congress can take appropriate steps, if necessary, to revise the new system.

It should be borne in mind that even with this new numerical limitation, the United States is giving more favorable treatment to its traditional friends in the Western Hemisphere than immigrants coming from elsewhere in the world. The Western Hemisphere is receiving a total of 120,000 numbers as compared with 170,000 to the rest of the world. The numerical limitation of 20,000 per country does not apply to countries of the Western Hemisphere.

The new system of assignment of immigration visas to the Western Hemisphere nations is basically consistent with U.S. immigration policy in relation to other foreign countries, and is designed to meet the needs and interests of the United States.

Thus, the new immigration law, by abolishing discrimination, preserving our traditional friendship for the Western Hemisphere and our policy toward refugees, and continuing the many safeguards of present law against undesirable or excessive immigration, will strengthen our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I include President Johnson's remarks when he signed the immigration bill at this point:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE SIGNING OF THE IMMIGRATION BILL

Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ambassador Goldberg, distinguished members of the leadership of the Congress, distinguished

Governors and mayors, my fellow countrymen, we have called the Congress here this afternoon not only to mark a very historic occasion, but to settle a very old issue that is in dispute. That issue is, to what congressional district does Liberty Island really belong—Congressman FARBERSTEIN or Congressman GALLAGHER? It will be settled by whomever of the two can walk first to the top of the Statue of Liberty.

This bill that we sign today is not a revolutionary bill. It does not affect the lives of millions. It will not reshape the structure of our daily lives, or really add importantly to either our wealth or our power.

Yet it is still one of the most important acts of this Congress and of this administration.

For it does repair a very deep and painful flaw in the fabric of American justice. It corrects a cruel and enduring wrong in the conduct of the American Nation.

Speaker McCormack and Congressman Celler more than almost 40 years ago first pointed that out in their maiden speeches in the Congress. And this measure that we will sign today will really make us truer to ourselves both as a country and as a people. It will strengthen us in a hundred unseen ways.

I have come here to thank personally each Member of the Congress who labored so long and so valiantly to make this occasion come true today, and to make this bill a reality. I cannot mention all their names for it would take much too long, but my gratitude and that of this Nation belongs to the 89th Congress.

We are indebted, too, to the vision of the late beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and to the support given to this measure by the then Attorney General, and now Senator, ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

In the final days of consideration, this bill had no more able champion than the present Attorney General, Nicholas Katzenbach, who, with New York's EMANUEL CELLER, and Senator TED KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and Congressman FEIGHAN of Ohio, and Senator MANSFIELD and Senator DIRKSEN constituting the leadership in the Senate, and Senator JAVRS helped to guide this bill to passage along with the help of the Members sitting in front of me today.

This bill says simply that from this day forth those wishing to immigrate to America shall be admitted on the basis of their skills and their close relationship to those already here.

This is a simple test, and it is a fair test. Those who can contribute most to this country—to its growth, to its strength, to its spirit—will be the first that are admitted to this land.

The fairness of this standard is so self evident that we may well wonder that it has not always been applied. Yet the fact is that for over four decades the immigration policy of the United States has been twisted and has been distorted by the harsh injustice of the national origins quota system.

Under that system the ability of new immigrants to come to America depended upon the country of their birth. Only three countries were allowed to supply 70 percent of all the immigrants.

Families were kept apart because a husband or a wife or a child had been born in the wrong place.

Men of needed skill and talent were denied entrance because they came from southern or eastern Europe or from one of the developing continents.

This system violated the basic principle of American democracy—the principle that values and rewards each man on the basis of his merit as a man.

It has been un-American in the highest sense because it has been untrue to the faith that brought thousands to these shores even before we were a country.

Today, with my signature, this system is abolished.

25244

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

We can now believe that it will never again shadow the gate to the American Nation with the twin barriers of prejudice and privilege.

Our beautiful America was built by a nation of strangers. From a hundred different places of home, they have poured forth into an empty land—joining and blending in one mighty and irresistible tide.

The land flourished because it was fed from so many sources; because it was nourished by so many cultures and traditions and peoples.

And from this experience, almost unique in the history of nations, has come America's attitude toward the rest of the world. We, because of what we are, feel safer and stronger in a world as varied as the people who make it up—a world where no country rules another and all countries can deal with the basic problems of human dignity and deal with those problems in their own way.

Now, under the monument which has welcomed so many to our shores, the American Nation returns to the finest of its traditions today.

The days of unlimited immigration are past.

But those who do come will come because of what they are, and not because of the land from which they sprung.

When the earliest settlers poured into a wild continent there was no one to ask them where they came from. The only question was: Were they sturdy enough to make the journey, were they strong enough to clear the land, were they enduring enough to make a home for freedom, and were they brave enough to die for liberty if it became necessary to do so.

And so it has been through all the great and testing moments of American history. This year we see in Vietnam men dying—men named Fernandez and Zajac and Zelinko and Mariano and McCormick.

Neither the enemy who killed them nor the people whose independence they have fought to save ever asked them where they or their parents came from. They were all Americans. It was for freedom and for America that they gave their all, they gave their lives and selves.

By eliminating that same question as a test for immigration the Congress proves ourselves worthy of those men and worthy of our own traditions as a nation.

So it is in that spirit that I declare this afternoon to the people of Cuba that those who seek refuge here in America will find it. The dedication of America to our traditions as an asylum for the oppressed is going to be upheld.

I have directed the Departments of State and Justice and Health, Education, and Welfare to immediately make all the necessary arrangements to permit those in Cuba who seek freedom to make an orderly entry into the United States of America.

Our first concern will be with those Cubans who have been separated from their children and their parents and their husbands and their wives that are now in this country. Our next concern is with those who are imprisoned for political reasons.

And I will send to the Congress tomorrow a request for supplementary funds of \$12,600,000 to carry forth the commitment that I am making today.

I am asking the Department of State to seek through the Swiss Government immediately the agreement of the Cuban Government in a request to the president of the International Red Cross Committee. The request is for the assistance of the Committee in processing the movement of refugees from Cuba to Miami. Miami will serve as a port of entry and temporary stopping place for refugees as they settle in other parts of this country.

And to all the voluntary agencies in the United States, I appeal for their continu-

ation and expansion of their magnificent work. Their help is needed in the reception and settlement of those who choose to leave Cuba. The Federal Government will work closely with these agencies in their tasks of charity and brotherhood.

I want all the people of this great land of ours to know of the really enormous contribution which the compassionate citizens of Florida have made to humanity and to decency. And all States in this Union can join with Florida now in extending the hand of helpfulness and humanity to our Cuban brothers.

The lesson of our times is sharp and clear in this movement of people from one land to another. Once again, it stamps the mark of failure on a regime when many of its citizens voluntarily choose to leave the land of their birth for a more hopeful home in America. The future holds little hope for any government where the present holds no hope for the people.

And so we Americans will welcome these Cuban people. For the tides of history run strong, and in another day, they can return to their homeland to find it cleansed of terror and free from fear.

Over my shoulder here you can see Ellis Island, whose vacant corridors echo today the joyous sounds of long-ago voices.

And today we can all believe that the lamp of this grand old lady is brighter today—and the golden door that she guards gleams more brilliantly in the light of an increased liberty for the people from all the countries of the globe.

Thank you very much.

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE FOGARTY BEFORE THE WORKSHOP AT TRINITY COLLEGE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

(Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. BINGHAM) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a speech which I delivered before the workshop at Trinity College, Washington, D.C., on Wednesday, July 14, 1965:

PROPPING OPEN THE COLLEGE GATES
(By the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY)

I am delighted to be here this morning and I am honored to have been invited to participate in this workshop. The scope and breadth of the topics that you have set yourselves for discussion is certainly impressive. It is most encouraging to those of us who are called upon to consider what the Federal role in support of higher education should be—and how this role should properly be played—to see a group such as this giving serious and concentrated thought to the role of women's colleges in broadening the spiritual, intellectual, and civic life of the community.

Both these roles—that of the Federal Government and that of the smaller colleges—are in a period of change. The impact of politics on Catholic women's colleges is therefore not just an interesting topic for a series of discussion; it is a vital issue in which you, as educators, and I, as a legislator, must be equally concerned. I am, of course, speaking of politics not in its abstract sense as "the science and art of government," nor in its earlier partisan sense, but in the sense of Webster's second definition: "the practice of managing affairs of public policy." Higher education has become a prime problem of public policy. The solution of this problem in the best interest of the Nation, of the educational institutions and, above all, in

the interest of the young people to be educated, is a task demanding our thoughtful cooperation in a spirit of unselfish public service.

Much has been said and written about the extraordinarily rapid growth of college enrollment in this country. Of course this creates problems but it should neither frighten nor deter us. Rapid growth is one population, gross national product, health of the most characteristic aspects of American life—it is reflected in statistics on our services, research, and so forth. With this growth has come an increasing complexity in making our lives and in making our livings.

In one respect, this complexity simply means that a college education today has the sort of value that was attributed to a high school education a generation ago.

But in another, more important sense, which perhaps defines the Federal Government's interests and responsibilities in education, this complexity reflects the enormous and accelerating economic and social growth of this Nation in the past few decades.

College education, as a luxury of a privileged minority, is inappropriate when we are dealing, as we must deal, with the fundamental human rights and welfare of all our people. At no time in our history has this country required more of its people to understand the democratic process, to comprehend the issues on our national agenda, to help develop reasonable, compassionate laws and programs.

In his special message to Congress on education, in 1963, President Kennedy said:

"For the individual, the doors to the schoolhouse, to the library and to the college lead to the richest treasures of our open society: to the power of knowledge—to the training and skills necessary for productive employment—to the wisdom, the ideals, and the culture which enrich life—and to the creative, self-disciplined understanding of society needed for good citizenship in today's changing and challenging world."

"For the Nation, increasing the quality and availability of education is vital to both our national security and domestic well-being."

Education must be one of our primary national goals—perhaps I should say the primary national goal because nothing matters more to the future of our country.

Higher education has become a prerequisite to the fulfillment of the individual's potential in society, and to the continuing strength and leadership of this country. The magnitude of this was spelled out by the American Council on Education testifying in favor of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. By 1980, the Council said, every existing college and university in this country will have to double its enrollment—and 1,000 new institutions will have to be created with an average enrollment of 2,500 each.

This assignment for education is enormous. In less than 15 years we shall have to more than double what it has taken more than 300 years to build. I, for one, do not doubt that we can do this. In fact, we can do what needs to be done in many ways—we can do it haphazardly, chaotically, frantically, or with a good deal of deliberate thought to planning and proper organization.

The expanding demand for college education generates a corresponding need for expanded facilities. Most of our educational institutions are working energetically to meet this need. Indeed, many of our smaller colleges welcome this task as a challenge and as an opportunity for growth. This is natural—and it is healthy, provided the growth is carefully geared to the pattern of emerging needs.

We hear a great deal these days about the need for more centers of excellence. Certainly, every educational institution must strive to be a center of excellence—but does this mean that all these institutions should strive

October 7, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A5661

as a rather more important sort of trouble, especially as the Vietcong fortress areas are in the main only inhabited by the Vietcong troops.

THE LATEST OF UNWANTED BABIES

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The 86th Congress last week earned a footnote in history by writing birth control into both our foreign and domestic policies. Then it went itself one better by preventing a population explosion which could have added another municipality to the 18,000 which already exist as the brawling, unkept, and unruly problem children of the Nation. The astonishing 89th sidetracked the administration bill for home rule in the District of Columbia. It substituted a bill that called for referendum and would postpone the evil day for at least a year and maybe more—provided, of course, that the old pro in the White House doesn't pitch himself out of this defeat in the final innings of the session.

Listening last week to the House debate on home rule, the reporter heard every argument except the one that mattered: for heaven's sake, leave well enough alone.

The bill's proponents yapped about taxation without representation. But we all pay the Federal taxes which support the Nation's city, as well as the Nation's many other institutions. And we residents of the Nation's only city did vote in 1964 for the national offices of President and Vice President.

The bill's opponents yapped about anything that would postpone the final vote. They could hardly be blamed. They were desperate in the teeth of a demagogic tornado. This is a city without industry, except for Government, and without roots. It is a city from which crime and undesirable immigration are driving out such private financial capital as there is. The new telephone directory shows an exodus of phone-using persons and enterprises. The stock of the Potomac Electric & Power Co. is on the skids.

The anticipated home rule is the reason for the flight. The reality of home rule is expected to turn flight into rout. But Congress insisted upon becoming the legislative midwife to the most unwanted child of the century.

As if to document the fatuity of the House action, the mail last week brought materials from Los Angeles and New York, both in the throes of municipal anguish.

Poor Sam Yorty. The mayor of Los Angeles was writing to newsmen and columnists about a wolf that had come down on his fold. The Poverty Corps—the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity—was turning his slums into a "huge pork barrel," not for the city's poor but for the poor's Federal protectors. A charter of municipality is no immunity from the fix-its of Federalia. Here in Washington we will build a city hall that will become another province for the czars of the welfare state to plunder.

From Manhattan came a new book, "A City Destroying Itself" by Richard Whalen, author of the Ambassador Joe Kennedy biography: "A Founding Father." Whalen tells of the built-in capacity for self-destruction that exists in cities. Washington and New York are much alike. The two towns hold enormous concentrations of human skills. They are filled with monuments and collections of knowledge that attest to the greatness of America and of Western civilization.

But, alas, are even the best of cities self-governable? Do the power and magnetism of the few civic grandees crush the more humble human spirit of the many? Is there in a city no neighborly comradeship that tempers the wind of the unshorn lambs?

In Washington this protection has been supplied by Congress to an extent that no

city hall seems able to do. In Gotham, as Whalen writes:

"The New Yorker of humble talents and ambitions derives no benefit from living in the world's greatest city, but instead pays more or less each year."

These are the forces which this author finds to be destroying the cities: the venality and apathy of local politics; the cold unconcern of the financial and social rulers for the ruled.

It's a cruel, unsympathetic world into which to bring an infant municipality—and this was almost done by a Congress which has been preaching birth control.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Sept. 30, 1965]

STOPPING REDS WAS CREDO OF DEAD MARINE—
WROTE OF PLIGHT OF VIETNAMESE

Marine Cpl. Edwin J. Falloon, 20, firmly believed communism must be halted at any cost. He gave his life at Phu Bai in South Vietnam fighting for that belief.

"He was very concerned about the situation over there and he wanted to do anything that could be done about it," his father, Dr. Edwin L. Falloon, 9543 Central Park Avenue, Evergreen Park, said yesterday. "He was due to be coming out of Vietnam and was the next on the list to leave."

BROTHER RICE GRADUATE

Corporal Falloon was graduated from Brother Rice High School in 1963 and shortly thereafter joined the Marine Corps. He was a member of the 3d Marine Amphibious Group that was sent to South Vietnam in April.

"In all his letters he wrote of the plight of the people of South Vietnam," Dr. Falloon said. "He tried to pretend that he wasn't in any danger, but we knew he was."

Dr. and Mrs. Falloon have three other sons and four daughters. They are Robert, 13; Tom, 6; Jim, 4; Marilyn, 16; Jeanne, 14; Marguarite, 10; and Patricia, 9.

NOTIFIED TUESDAY

The family received notice of Corporal Falloon's death from the Defense Department on Tuesday.

The Defense Department yesterday identified two other servicemen who were killed in action in Vietnam. They were Navy Lt. Comdr. Carl J. Woods of Lemoore, Calif., and Army Lt. James P. Kelly of Hatboro, Pa. Listed as missing in action was Air Force Capt. George R. Hall, whose hometown was not listed.

Immigration Bill Conference

SPEECH

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am in support of the conference report on the immigration bill which is now under consideration by the House.

I think this bill is long overdue. Over a long period of time now, I have been filing and pressing a major immigration bill designed to remedy some of the problems that this bill deals with.

It is a bill which would allocate and transfer some unused quota numbers from some nations to other nations having oversubscribed quotas. It had the support of three Presidents and many groups and people.

My bill was designed, just as the current bill is, to reunite families and expedite the admission to the United States of the loved ones of American citizens, who have served this Nation faithfully and well, established themselves here and brought up their children here, and who have as good loyal citizens contributed greatly, in war and peace, to the security, well-being and prosperity of our nation.

Naturally I am gratified that the principles of immigration law which I have striven for so long in this body have finally been written into this great human charter of immigration which we are considering today.

It was back in April 1953 that I first sponsored legislation to redistribute unused immigration quotas, which averaged about 60,000 yearly then. I did this in an effort to help correct the inequities in the immigration laws which discriminated against such countries as Italy and Greece in the allocation of immigration quotas.

I was prompted then, as I am now in my support of the bill now before the House, to help unite families here with their loved ones remaining overseas. I was convinced then, and I am convinced now more than ever, that liberalization of the immigration laws is a matter of simple justice and I am glad that this House is finally acting to revise the national origins clause so as to help thousands of worthy American citizens with close relatives caught in the web of discriminatory quotas who have been waiting for many years for the chance to come to this country.

As is the case in the bill now before the House, my bill was drafted in such a way that no increase in the overall quota totals is required. My bill merely redistributes the unused quotas with the added provision that those countries benefiting from the unused quota system would repay, whenever necessary, over a 5-year period, the countries from which additional quota numbers have been received. This would help such nations as Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Armenia, Albania, and other countries behind the Iron Curtain whenever freedom is restored to these unhappy lands.

However, I want to make it clear that I oppose the concessions made in the conference to the other body by writing into this bill a ceiling on immigration for our neighbors of the American hemisphere. To my mind, this is a step backward, and I am fearful that it will cause a great deal of misunderstanding on the part of our neighbors.

It is true that these neighbors will still receive 40 percent of the total quotas provided by the bill, but nevertheless, for the first time in history quota restrictions are imposed upon them, and I think this is most unfortunate and most unwise.

How the formula designed to admit people on the basis of their skills, talent, ability, and so forth, will work out is problematical, and depends upon the way the law is administered.

While scholarship, talents, and ability always have their place and contribute

A5662

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

October 7, 1965

much, we should not overlook the fact that, as our own national experience so clearly reveals, it is from the lowly, from the humble, from the unschooled and untutored, and often from those who for long have been denied opportunities, that much of the great leadership and most loyal followership of this Nation has emerged.

This Nation needs hewers of wood and drawers of water who can furnish the sinews for our economy and for our way of life and for the development of our family structure, from which so many leaders have sprung, and so many strong, loyal people have come to defend the country in time of need, to operate its factories, its transportation systems, its farms and do the work that has to be done in any great economic system like ours.

I hope and urge that the administrators of the immigration bill will have this factor in mind and will not close the doors to the worthy, the industrious, to the honest, eager, if ordinary, citizens who want to come to this country as many of our forebears did, to seek the opportunities of its freedom and by their devotion, loyalty, and labor lift themselves up and lift their families up to strengthen the fiber and the leadership of the country.

There is a great place for the geniuses, the supertalented, and the well to do. But they alone will not suffice. We must also, to the extent we can, be a haven for the worthy poor, the unprivileged, the disadvantaged, those of the strength, will, and determination to make their way, those willing to work their way up, those who will be loyal to American institutions, a credit and asset to the Nation.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I think the committee, on the whole, has done well in formulating and presenting this bill and I think it will be helpful to our foreign relations and hope it will be helpful in other ways as well: to our friends and neighbors who can be reunited with their dear ones, to our economy to meet some of its needs, and to our great Government and our local communities to whom fresh, young vigorous blood may, as in the past, bring new strength, new ideas of shaping our free institutions along sound free, constructive lines, designed to cope with and conquer the problems of the space age.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein as part of my remarks a very fine letter from the highly dedicated, able and distinguished chairman of the subcommittee which heard and reported this legislation, my beloved and esteemed friend, Chairman MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, which makes it clear that the new immigration bill as amended by the subcommittee and approved by the full committee under the able leadership of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], provides for the redistribution of the unused quota numbers and thereafter eliminates the national origin quota system and repeals section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, all of which were primary objectives of my original bill. It has been a long strug-

gle to enact this bill and I trust it will prove worthy of our confidence.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D.C., August 12, 1965.
Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I have your letter of July 15, concerning H.R. 2078 to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, so as to provide that all quota numbers not used in any year shall be made available to immigrants in oversubscribed areas in the following year, and for other purposes. Your bill would provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers over 5 fiscal years ending June 30, 1971.

The new immigration bill, as amended by my subcommittee and approved by the full Committee on the Judiciary provides for the redistribution of the unused quota numbers during the next 3 fiscal years and thereafter eliminates the national origins quota system. In addition, your bill repeals section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which is also repealed by H.R. 2580 as amended.

I am enclosing a copy of the report on that legislation.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
Chairman.

**Needed: A U.S. Congress With Ability
To Say "No"**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1965

MR. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, the Greenville Piedmont, in an editorial of September 27, 1965, has made some timely observations on the surrender of congressional power and authority to the executive and judicial branches. I hope that everyone of my colleagues will read this editorial and take its message to heart. The editorial follows:

**NEEDED: A U.S. CONGRESS WITH ABILITY
TO SAY "No"**

The American Enterprise Institute has put its finger on a major threat to liberty in the United States. In a report on the present role of Congress, the institute concludes that the general public is guilty of creating "a veritable threat of dictatorship" by placing both the office and the person of the President on an exalted pedestal.

This conclusion stems from a basic fact about human nature: If you give a man a job and unlimited resources to accomplish it, he will expand his job into areas of more power.

The expansion of the presidency into areas formerly held by the Congress is exactly what has been happening in the United States for decades. It has been happening because the general public has failed to elect Congressmen who would insist upon maintaining the traditional system of checks and balances in the National Government.

As a result the present Congress has become but a puppet of the President—and the present President has no hesitancy about pulling the strings.

Seldom if ever has congressional influence been at such a low ebb. Not only has the President stolen power from the Congress; so, too, has the Supreme Court. The Court

has gone far afield from its constitutional role of interpreting the law. It has demonstrated its power to make law as well.

Unless this trend is reversed—and soon—Congress will become a meaningless debating society, if the President will allow it the privilege of debate, that is.

The present Congress shows no signs of having either the willingness or the ability to pull itself and the Nation back from the brink of presidential dictatorship. Perhaps the next Congress will. It will only if the people of the United States have the good sense to elect individual Congressmen who possess the brains, stamina and intestinal fortitude to say "no" to both President and Court—and make it stick.

**Pope Paul's Appeal for Peace at the
United Nations; and the First Papal
Visit in History to America**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1965

MR. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, only God knows if Pope Paul's sacrifice at his age and his unprecedented appeal to the United Nations today will result in a serious and successful consideration for true peace by the world. I am sure my colleagues will pray sincerely with His Holiness for the peace that is so desired by mankind and, to date, so elusive.

No matter the outcome, however, there is no doubt that the United States was blessed by the presence—the first time in history—of the Vicar of Christ, Peter's successor, on any American shore. To those millions of Americans of his faith, this visit was indeed a blessing. To those of other faiths, to whom he extended his arms, it was both a courtesy and history.

The author of the prize-winning book, "Love's Stigmata," and also author of the famous poetical tribute to President Kennedy called "Ask Not," which was cited in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 14, 1964, by the beloved friend of all of us, former Senator Kenneth B. Keating, of New York—this poet-friend of mine, Miss Kay Magenheimer of Babylon, N.Y., has written for her next book the following poem on the Pope's visit which she has given me permission to quote. And I do so now because I believe it contains for history the essence of our times and the significance of Pope Paul's visit to the United Nations.

The author-poet asks that you bear in mind that the word "devil" as used in the poem is used not only in the religious sense but is also symbolic of all the diabolical strictures and shocking actions against such a country as ours which means so well and sacrifices so many wonderful lives and so much hard-earned money to protect freedom here and around the world.

A beautifully engrossed copy of this poem was presented as a gift to His Holiness during his visit. It follows:

October 5, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

25133

them, too, that discrimination against race and color are disappearing from the American scene and that it was the law which initiated this renaissance of human rights. Yes, tell them, if they care to listen, that the supremacy of law in the affairs of men is the triumphant climax of man's eternal quest for human dignity and freedom. Recite the record of those dark and terrible moments of history when the common man could cry, in tragic truth, "right forever on the scaffold, wrong forever on the throne," but that now, with the law as our arbiter of justice, we can believe, with reassuring hope, the last two lines of that couplet:

"Yet that scaffold sways the future, and behind the dim unknown
Standeth God within the shadows keeping watch above his own."

THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT OF 1965

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, it is especially fitting to say a few words about one of this year's most significant legislative accomplishments, the reform of our immigration laws. We all have an interest in this subject if only because, in the phrase of President Kennedy, we are all, except for the Indians, a nation of immigrants or their descendants. But for 40 years, and despite the urging of four Presidents, our immigration laws contained the discriminatory national origins formula, emphasizing birthplace in choosing our immigrants rather than personal merit or family ties.

The results were grotesque. A much-needed scientific or medical research specialist would be kept out because he was born in a disfavored country, while an unskilled laborer from northern Europe would be welcomed. The laborer would also be favored ahead of the mother of an American citizen born in the wrong place, who might have to wait for years before her son could bring her to join him. Such a system, which presumes that some people are inferior to others solely because of their birthplace, was intolerable on principle alone.

Perhaps the single most discriminatory aspect of the law was the so-called Asian-Pacific triangle provision. This clause required persons of 50 percent or more Asian ancestry to be assigned to national quotas not by their own place of birth, but according to that of their Asian forebears.

There was the case of a young South American in the Republic of Colombia, who was eligible and fully qualified to come here. His wife was also a native and a citizen of Colombia. But she was the daughter of a Chinese father. As a result, this young woman had to be considered half-Chinese and thus admissible only under the quota for Chinese persons of 105. This meant that if her husband chose to come ahead to the United States, he would have to wait for his wife until the year 2048 if he did not become a citizen. If he did become a citizen, however, he and his wife could be reunited in a mere 5 years.

To end the injustice and the costs which the national origins system needlessly inflicted, President Johnson last January called on Congress, in a special message, to pass the administration's immigration reform bill and to do so

promptly. The new law which he signed on October 3, at the Statue of Liberty, selects immigrants within an overall limit of 170,000 on the basis not of birthplace or ancestry but rather by a system of preferences based on family relationships to our people and special skills that will be of real benefit to our country.

The new law means fairer, better selection of immigrants within the limits we are willing to accept. The law does not open the floodgates to an excessive amount of immigration. Moreover, all the present safeguards against subversives, criminals, illiterates, potential public charges, and other undesirables are retained. The safeguards against immigrants who might cause unemployment are actually strengthened. The overall result is an immigration law that is far more just, humane, and beneficial to the Nation.

EXPLORATION ASSISTANCE

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on September 14, 1965, President Johnson submitted to Congress the 14th semiannual report of the Office of Minerals Exploration of the Department of the Interior for the period ending June 30, 1965. The report is available to the public on request to the Department. It shows the achievements and program of the Office of Minerals Exploration for that period.

I ask unanimous consent that President Johnson's letter accompanying the report and an excerpt from the report explaining the program be printed in the Record.

The letter was addressed to the President of the Senate.

There being no objection, the President's letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 14th semiannual report of the Office of Minerals Exploration, Geological Survey, from the Secretary of the Interior as prescribed by section 5 of the act of August 21, 1958, entitled "To provide a program for the discovery of the mineral reserves of the United States, its territories and possession by encouraging exploration for minerals, and for other purposes."

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE.

EXPLORATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The Office of Minerals Exploration in the Geological Survey conducts a program to encourage exploration for domestic mineral reserves, excluding organic fuels, by providing financial assistance in exploration to private industry under Public Law 85-701, approved August 21, 1958 (72 Stat. 700; 30 U.S.C. sec. 642). The Office of Minerals Exploration also administers contracts with royalty obligations remaining from a similar program conducted by the former Defense Minerals Exploration Administration under section 303(a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended. Effective July 1, 1965, the Office of Minerals Exploration was transferred to the Geological Survey (30 F.R. 2877, 30 F.R. 3461).

EXPANSION OF AMERICAN BEEF EXPORTS

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, as a member of the Small Business Commit-

tee for the past 9 months, it has been my great pleasure to join with the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] in his tireless search for ways and means by which American beef producers can increase their exports to Western Europe.

Coming, as I do, from a State where beef production amounts to 398 million pounds annually, this question is of vital interest to me and to my State, and I have devoted many hours to a study of the complex factors involved.

There is still much to be done, including more hearings later this year which will, I hope, focus further public attention on the very serious questions of discriminatory ocean freight rates, the lack of adequately equipped ships, docks and facilities, and the need for aggressive development of our potential European markets.

However, we have already achieved remarkable export gains. Fresh and frozen beef exports in 1964 were 35,347,000 pounds, four times the 1963 total, and figures for the first quarter of 1965 indicate that we will do much better this year. Beef and veal exports increased by 101.2 percent in the first quarter of 1965, compared to the first quarter of 1964.

Shipment of live cattle has tripled in the first 9 months of 1965, compared to the full year last year. The figures are 4,469 for 1964 and 12,247 for 1965 through September 30.

Since World War I, we have not been an important factor in the world beef export trade. Discriminatory ocean freight rates, combined with rapidly increasing consumption at home, caused American producers and packers to concentrate on the domestic market.

There was little incentive to compete with producers in Australia or Argentina when shipping rates were as much as 294 percent higher to Americans.

But a rapidly rising standard of living in Europe and a reduction, both in Europe's domestic beef production and in its normal import supply, made American producers aware about 18 months ago of a potential new marketing opportunity.

In looking at the broader results of the Fairbanks conference, we should not overlook significant steps made toward saving the polar bear from extinction.

My interest in the polar bear and the interest of my State in the polar bear comes from the fact that Alaska borders on the Arctic Ocean and counts the polar bear as one of her native creatures. My concern comes from the fact that we know so little about this magnificent animal. This lack of knowledge was the principal theme of my address to the conference where I pointed out that we do not even know whether there is one population or several populations of bears, moving from nation to nation on the slowly revolving ice pack. The meeting, I suggested, should be concerned with means of improving world information on polar bear movements, reproduction, longevity and population structure.

Mr. President, the meeting was as good for polar bears as it was for people.

25134

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

October 5, 1965

Many points were agreed upon. The discussion of the delegates was intensive and held in a spirit of full cooperation.

The results of the meeting have been compiled in a series of 18 documents. I have selected several which I feel should be called to the attention of my colleagues and to readers of the Record and I ask unanimous consent that the "Summaries of Country Reports," the "Resolutions," the "Statement of Accord," the "Conclusions and Recommendations," and the final list of participants be printed at this point.

I also ask that the President's letter naming me as his representative at the conference be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

As I pointed out earlier, cattle shipped by boat have tripled in volume this year. Mr. Jay Taylor of Amarillo, Tex., who was chairman of the President's beef export mission to Europe last year, gave the committee an interesting example of American business ingenuity when he testified at our hearings earlier this year.

Ordinarily, live cattle are fed hay, which is very bulky and wasteful of space, while being transported by ship. But Mr. Taylor showed the committee a feed he has developed which is all protein and grain. It occupies much less space, and the steer will gain up to 20 pounds during the trip, worth some 40 cents a pound, so the cattleman recovers part of his shipping costs.

But European tastes in beef are still attuned to the less expensive, leaner, range-fed beef of the type produced in Argentina and Australia.

The mass demand in Europe is still for grades which are similar to our cutter and canner grades. Therefore, I believe our great opportunity in the immediate future lies in the development of and an appreciation for Choice and Good grain-fed American beef in Europe.

We must aim for the American tourist and the more affluent European, while at the same time we push a continuing education program which will widen this market.

The promotional campaigns now being carried out in Europe by the American Meat Institute and the Department of Agriculture deserve our encouragement and support.

Both these agencies, working in close cooperation, have planned a number of educational and promotional events in Europe and the United Kingdom this fall and winter.

Concurrently, we must continue to work for further reductions in freight rates, both on the high seas and domestically, if we are to establish a permanent export trade in beef. It was heartening to learn last week that ocean shippers have agreed to continue their experimental rate reductions beyond September 30, the original cutoff date.

In addition, there is need for extensive modification and modernization of dockside storage and handling equipment, and extensive modernization to ships, to handle a growing beef export trade.

We must be vigilant against efforts to create new barriers to American beef in

Europe through overly restrictive regulations and inspection requirements.

While bending every effort to develop the fresh and frozen beef market, we must not neglect one in which we are already well established, that of variety meats—tongue, kidney, liver, and so forth.

In 1964, this country exported 156 million pounds of variety meats to the EEC countries, with a value of \$32.5 million.

In summary, Mr. President, the success of our efforts to develop a major beef export trade in Europe and the United Kingdom is dependent on a variety of complex factors.

But the potential value of this trade—estimates range upward of 200,000 tons and \$170 million a year—makes it imperative that we do absolutely everything required to help it along.

To that end, I propose the establishment of a permanent U.S. Beef Commission to examine all aspects and all problems of the trade, and to recommend appropriate solutions.

Specifically, the Beef Commission should work toward the solution of the following problems, as well as others which come to its attention during its continuing studies:

First. A complete reappraisal and readjustment of inland freight rates—the rates from the point of production to the point of embarkation—is needed.

Second. It must work for elimination of the disparities which exist in ocean freight rates, and which damage American exporters. Our goal should be equal treatment in shipping costs.

Third. Encourage the American shipbuilding industry to make provision for modern refrigerated beef shipping space, both in new and existing vessels.

Fourth. Promote the availability of oceans transports for beef on the hoof.

Fifth. Remove the redtape which now entangles exporters when they grapple with the so-called health regulations of importing nations. We must develop uniform inspection and health regulations which will free the shipper of bureaucratic redtape.

Sixth. The Beef Commission must initiate an aggressive and comprehensive marketing program, including advertising, consumer education, trade fairs, personal contacts, and development of detailed knowledge of trade sources in Europe.

Once established, the Beef Commission will be able to provide the help and the expert knowledge that American producers and shippers need to obtain and to retain their fair share of the world market.

SIGNING OF THE IMMIGRATION ACT BY PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on October 3, President Johnson, standing before the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor, signed into law a most important act of Congress to improve our immigration laws. This legislation, which he recommended to Congress in a special message earlier this year, has abolished the national origins quota system of immigration. As the President ob-

served in his special message, this system reflected "neither good government nor good sense."

For a good many years, thousands upon thousands of people in excess of the numbers we can reasonably admit have desired to come to this country. As a result, the basic problem for our national immigration policy is to maintain a fair system of selection among the applicants for admission.

For over 40 years we have made our choice by means of the national origins system, under which quotas were assigned to each country on the basis of the national origins of the population of the United States in 1920.

The new law has abolished that system and the injustices it has produced. Now we have turned away from an irrational concern with the place of birth of an immigrant—or of his ancestors—and have committed ourselves to a meaningful concern with the contribution he can make or the need for reuniting him with his family.

There were many objections to the system we have discarded. First of all, it did not even do what it proposed. It assumed that each country would use its quota in full. But the countries with the largest quotas—England and Ireland included—fell 50,000 short of their total each year. Since the law did not allow transfers of unused quota numbers between nations, these 50,000 numbers were denied to countries with waiting lists. In short, the numbers were lost. The new law, by doing away with quotas and establishing a first-come, first-served arrangement, prevents this wastage.

I might add that the new law does not significantly increase the total immigration per year. It allows for an increase about equal to these 50,000 numbers unused under the quota system.

A second objection to our prior policy was that it failed to serve the national interest. No matter how skilled or badly needed a man might be, if he was born in the wrong country, he had to wait—perhaps beyond his life expectancy—while others less qualified than he could enter the United States at will. That situation has been corrected, and a man with qualifications or skills we need will be considered equally with others in his position.

A third aspect of the policy we have changed is perhaps the most compelling. That aspect was its frequent cruelty. One of the fundamental objectives of our society is unity and integrity of the family. Unfortunately, the old system often kept parent from child and brother from brother for years—and sometimes for decades. It separated families arbitrarily and without rational purpose.

Now we have insured that parent need not be kept apart from son or daughter and have given adequate recognition to family relationships generally. Best of all, we have ended the possibility that families may remain broken simply because of differing places of birth.

A fourth point to make is that we have removed from our statute books an affront to most of the nations of the world. No longer need we be defensive about a scheme that blatantly pro-

October 5, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

25135

claimed as a matter of national policy that some peoples are not as worthy of consideration for American citizenship as others. As all our Presidents beginning with President Truman have pointed out, the national origins law was a constant irritant to amicable relations around the globe.

Finally, the national origins system contradicted our fundamental national ideals and basic values. It denied recognition to the individual and treated him as one of a mass. It judged a man not on the basis of his worth or ability to contribute to our society, but on his place of birth—or, worse yet, in some cases, on the place of birth of his ancestors.

We have now rid ourselves of these distortions of our true principles and have returned to our early practice of viewing all men for admission to our land without regard to their origins, or the origins of their forebears. The act of Congress that the President signed before the "Grand Old Lady" on Liberty Island does the Nation proud.

COLLEGE ADMISSIONS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, each spring thousands of high school seniors anxiously await admittance to the colleges and universities of their choice. Many are rewarded with success. Others meet disappointment. In fact, some 100,000 graduates who want to go on to college next year will find in April that they have not been accepted by an institution of higher learning.

In many cases the heartache and confusion that result could have been avoided by sensible advice and reasonable planning. A series of articles entitled "Getting Into College," by John C. Hoy, dean of admissions at Wesleyan University in my own great State of Connecticut, offers excellent counsel to prospective college students and their parents as well.

In these times, when a higher education is of the utmost importance and competition to get one becomes more intense each year, Dean Hoy's experience and concern with the problem of finding the right institution for the right student is of interest to us all.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this series of articles be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GETTING INTO COLLEGE—COLLEGES EYE THE ARTFUL APPLICANT
(By John C. Hoy)

Unlike baseball, it's the spring batting average that means everything when applying to college. Most college admissions offices tell candidates if they have been accepted about mid-April, 5 months before the freshman year begins.

And each year at that time about 100,000 high school graduates learn that they have not found their college. Then a mad scramble for an opening—oftentimes anywhere—is started.

This is the first of a series of articles written with hope that you—or your son or daughter—will not be one of those 100,000.

The series is intended to offer advice to anyone who may be thinking of college someday. It should be of particular interest to parents and their children who are freshmen and sophomores in high school. For families with members in the junior or senior years of high school each article should be of vital concern.

In many cases the scramble for an opening could have been avoided; the candidate, by planning, should be capable of insuring a good batting average for himself.

Colleges usually publish a cutoff date for applications. New Year's Day is a popular deadline. The best practice is for the student to file applications well before the deadline. And the arrangement for an interview at the college as early as possible in the student's senior year, certainly prior to January 1, is wise.

It is important to file more than one application. I would recommend that candidates file four applications, each to a college that offers an interesting challenge to the student. The following table offers an idea of the way to go about selecting colleges to which applications should be sent.

First application: A long shot. Reaching for the moon. But worth a try.

Second application: This is a tough one. But there is a 50-50 chance.

Third application: Pretty sure of acceptance and it fills the bill.

Fourth application: A clear shot.

One may ask, why four applications? After all there is a nonrefundable applications fee, usually \$10 and increasing shortly to \$20 for many institutions.

There are good reasons. Let's discuss "reaching for the moon."

All colleges take gambles and long shots each year. Admissions officers pride themselves on their judgment. They feel instincts about certain candidates who don't on paper seem to have all the qualifications. And, if the admissions officers are doing a good job, their instinctive judgment can pay off for the candidate as well as the college.

Therefore, it is worthwhile for the student to do a little "reaching" too. Students shouldn't overextend themselves but neither should they hesitate to stretch up on their tiptoes when filing an application.

Since the odds are not with a long shot, the second and third choices have to be much more realistic.

Actually, although the student may classify the second choice as "tough," it should be within reach. It should be a choice that can be obtained, say, if the breaks are with him. In this instance, a bad break would be for the second school to receive an unusually high percentage of candidates, all having exceptional qualifications. This happens every year.

This is the reason for the third and fourth applications. The school the student is "pretty sure" of, the third application, may have an unusual year, too.

Thus, the investment of some extra time and dollars in filing four instead of one or two applications, is worthwhile insurance for the young individual who wants to go to the right college.

GETTING INTO COLLEGE—WILL 4-YEAR INVESTMENT PAY?

(By John C. Hoy)

If anyone in your family plans to go to college, you should all take an honest look at the size of the human investment ahead.

In all likelihood parents will be investing between \$10,000 and \$16,000 for tuition, room, board, books, travel, and incidental expenses during the 4-year period.

And since college-age men and women have reached the productive age, it is estimated that any one of them would be capa-

ble of earning somewhere between \$12,000 and \$20,000 had they not gone to college for 4 years.

These material statistics are called to a family's attention to point out that the decision before any college candidate is no small one, even by one of its relatively minor yardsticks, the dollar. A college education is without question the largest single investment most people ever make in themselves.

But there are other factors of even greater weight.

Four years carved out of one's youth is a significant period of time. How these 4 years are invested can substantially alter the individual's approach to all the challenges to be faced in the 5 or 6 decades of life after college; colleges have the peculiar power of shaping the aspirations of their graduates.

If this investment of dollars, earning potential, and 4 formative years is made unwisely, the price of the mistake can be the costliest parents or their offspring ever will have to face.

At the extreme—and too often the extreme is realized—the child may never have the opportunity to fulfill his potential. Thus this person's capacity for making a satisfactory way in the world may seriously be damaged. The price for this is often spelled out in dissatisfaction throughout life and a probable loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars in earning potential.

Unfortunately, there are more wrong than right decisions made about college. During the last half century more than 50 percent of students who entered college in this country became dropouts. Add to this staggering percentage the number of students who merely "got by" or who finished although they ended up in the wrong school or majoring in the wrong course. One begins to realize how much thought and effort is required to turn the odds in the favor of any student.

But the odds can be turned in one's favor providing the student is willing to give enough careful thought to the selection of a college and to the reasons for deciding to attend a particular school in the first place.

The student should never be allowed to back into the choice of a college. Instead, the choice must be made with eyes wide open. The candidate must be very much aware of all the alternatives. Young men and women must think and plot a campaign designed to familiarize themselves with the possibilities open to them in higher education. They must clarify their own philosophy of higher education and what they want to accomplish during these last years of formal preparation for life.

To plan wisely it must be recognized that men and women of 17 or 18 are essentially the persons they will become after youth has passed. Therefore, if they do the right job of assessing their potentials, their strengths and weaknesses, they will have made a good start toward the right college decision.

And it is extremely important for parents to realize that this is the time to allow the young adult to make his own decision and live with it.

Unless young adults can make this decision on their own, they are not ready for college.

This reality—that their child, ready to enter college, is already a young adult—is difficult for many parents to accept.

Once this self-appraisal has been made, the students themselves must decide which college can do the best job of recognizing their potentials and helping them refine these potentials. The process of a college education, after all, is usually more a refinement of potentials than a process of acquiring new ones.

This refinement process can take place in a wide variety of settings. Clearly no par-

25136

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

October 5, 1965

ticular institution has a priority on this kind of offering.

GETTING INTO COLLEGE—TIMING—WHEN IS A YOUTH READY? (By John C. Hoy)

If the average shoe size in the United States is 9, this does not mean that every person has a size 9 foot.

Neither does the fact that the average age of a college freshman is 17 or 18 mean that every youngster is ready for college immediately following high school.

Actually a good number of young people who take a job for a year or so after high school do better beginning college later than they would have otherwise.

These usually are young people who need further experience with the "real world" before they can gain a better sense of why they are planning a college education.

Colleges and universities are very much interested in students who have the kind of foresight such a move demonstrates.

There should be no embarrassment to a parent whose son or daughter takes a working intermission between high school and college. More and more colleges are encouraging their enrolled students to take a year off for just this purpose—often without regard to academic difficulty.

There are students who attend college because they have "nothing better to do." Not surprisingly, students of this sort often bog down in the "sophomore slump"—and drop out of college altogether.

From our experience we believe that many youngsters have the right instinct about whether they are ready for college. All too often it is the parents who force them into mistakes.

Parents, understandably, have a tendency to believe that their child will do well in college if only given the chance. This, in spite of a record of poor performance in high school.

But logic, no matter how one tries to stretch it, does not indicate that the student who did not like high school and did not do well there will enjoy college and get what he should out of it.

An unusually high percentage of parents who push this kind of a child often discover the term "late bloomer." They claim that their child, one who has "not achieved" in high school, is really a species of genius who has not yet shown his bud. Colleges are constantly dealing with young people. They are particularly well adept at recognizing the wide variety of "late bloomers" who apply for admission.

Putting pressure on underachievers to go to college is merely increasing the chance that these youths will drop out. The majority of college dropouts in the United States are youngsters who have been under this pressure.

Occasionally an applicant appears who does not present all the proper credentials, but clearly shows a particular dimension of independence or creativity which caused him to buck the system in high school. As a result this student did not gain the particular rewards—namely grades—given by the secondary school.

Such a student may, on the other hand, be a voracious reader. This student may possess a curiosity and diligence which leads into worlds of learning that actually may be unmeasurable by the standards of traditional achievement.

Parents would do well to allow their son's or daughter's guidance counselor and admissions officer to determine how truly unusual the candidate's case may be. When a parent says, "I have a truly unusual son, but * * *" the college admissions officer feels it's time to duck. This kind of information is best presented by the candidate personally. He will have ample opportunity

to do so on the application form or during this interview.

In general, colleges are quite suspicious of the candidate or parent who comes into the admissions office and uses the term "late bloomer" as an excuse for a poor high school record.

Actually, students who truly belong in this category are much too interested and involved in lively concerns to describe themselves in such a fashion.

In short, one of the real tests of whether a young man or young lady is ready to enter college is his or her ability to make an objective appraisal of themselves.

GETTING INTO COLLEGE—STUDENT—NOT PARENT—IS CANDIDATE (By John C. Hoy)

Applying to college is perhaps the first adult responsibility assumed by young people. It is certainly one of the most important tasks they will ever undertake.

I feel strongly that parents should recognize that the college application is the student's responsibility. Admissions officers far prefer to correspond directly with the students instead of their parents. Colleges admit students, not parents.

Too frequently, however, a father sends this initial letter on business stationery. It is almost as if he doubts his child's capacity to write a letter worthy of consideration. I recommend, instead, that routine correspondence from beginning to end should be between student and college.

A letter from parents is, of course, welcome when it describes a particular problem or some condition affecting their child's application. But generally I hold with the admissions officer's adage: "The thicker the folder, the thicker the kid."

Thus the overzealous parent can harm this offspring's chance of conducting an important "negotiation" and developing from that experience the qualities of independence that will contribute to eventual academic success. I am persuaded that the overly dependent youngster is far more likely to be a candidate for the 50-percent dropout group than the young individual with initiative.

This is not to say that high school students should willy-nilly go it alone in planning a college education. They can and should enlist all the help possible from their secondary school's guidance director or counselor.

The counselor has helped place hundreds of students in college. He truly qualifies as an expert in the entire college placement process. Parents can serve by subtly encouraging the student to make a sincere effort. But remember the line is thin between parental interest and parental pressure. Conflict with the parent is found to be at the root of the majority of academic and social difficulties suffered by most students.

Beyond being a source of information, the counselor also can assist the students invaluable by objectively appraising their qualifications for various colleges. Recommendations against trying one college or another should not be taken amiss. Parents too often misunderstand or feel offended when a counselor advises against a particular college.

The fact is, however, that the counselor's and student's interests are the same. The counselor wants to see students from his school enter colleges and universities where they will succeed.

Most counselors will suggest that students apply to three or four institutions. Most often the colleges recommended vary in terms of entrance requirements. It will be wise for students to apply to at least one institution where they can be relatively sure of admittance. It should, of course, be to a college well suited to the applicant's needs.

Failure to work out a careful program of

college applications too often means failure in entering college. Those who have not chosen wisely in applying to colleges often find that in the warm days of spring, they are out in the cold. Then they desperately—and too often hopelessly—seek opportunities in institutions at which they would have easily qualified if they had only applied in time.

But regard for proper timing is not to be mistaken as advocacy of overly early college planning. As an admissions officer, I urge early planning; it pays off in most situations in life. But premature planning is of little advantage—and tends to be rather neurotic.

One college president cautions: "Some ruin high school worrying about getting into college." To be specific, the junior year in secondary school is soon enough for actual college planning—assuming, of course, that the student began a college preparatory course in his freshman year.

I am dead set against students seeking interviews in the freshman and sophomore years. This puts too much "college" pressure on people before it is sensible for them to worry. And their "worrying" is not practical for the colleges and universities, either. Before junior year the student just has not compiled the academic and personal evidence needed for an admissions officer to be able to take action.

"IN" SCHOOL OFTEN PROVES "FAR OUT"—GETTING INTO COLLEGE (By John C. Hoy)

Americans receive a great deal of training in buying on the basis of name and size. Whatever its value in everyday life, this procedure just does not make sense in selecting a college.

There are more than 2,200 accredited, 4-year colleges and universities in this country. An unparalleled dimension of choice is open to prospective students and their parents.

Nevertheless, the thinking of far too many students and parents is obscured by the feeling that perhaps 50 of those 2,200 institutions are the "in" places to go.

At Wesleyan University we face this problem to some degree. My advice to students who seem to be applying because of Wesleyan's prestige is to think again and decide what they really seek in a college education.

Basking in supposed prestige is no substitute for an education. Furthermore, in entirely practical terms, many who first go to a college or university for superficial reasons eventually wake up and become very unhappy. Some are so disillusioned that they drop out.

The naivete of this prestige business can easily be demonstrated. Consider the case of current and recent presidents of three renowned universities, Brown, Duke, and Harvard. All three were formerly presidents of Lawrence University in Appleton, Wis. The energy and leadership that these distinguished men have so impressively displayed for their name institutions was earlier matched by their services at one small Wisconsin college.

In fact, an extraordinary number of distinguished university presidents, professors, and researchers have attended and taught in comparatively unknown institutions. A Knapp-Goodrich study, "The Origins of American Scientists," reveals that on a scale of the production of scientists, 40 of America's top 50 institutions are small liberal arts colleges. Many of these are of limited reputation. Most are located in the Middle and Far West. Only three large, well-known institutions—Johns Hopkins, Chicago, and Wisconsin—were listed at all among the top 50.

Similar studies of the collegiate background of business and industrial leaders

October 5, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

25147

His shipyard, the largest of any river town, was located just south of the opera house. Employing 400 men, during the Civil War it delivered to the Navy in only 90 days the steam gunboat *Kanawha*.

At the foot of State Street in Hartford, businessmen and their families used to board the steamboat, dine in style as she puffed downstream, and after a refreshing sleep arrive early the next morning in New York—all for \$2.50 per person. But the railroad whistle had long since sounded the death-knell of the steamboat, and her last trip was made in 1931, bringing to a close three centuries of dependence upon the river as the main artery of trade and travel.

Today, there is nary a landing place for a single pleasure boat. A few old pilings and bulkheads, like ancient ruins, give mute testimony of what used to be, and the dikes shut out any river view. Behind them has risen a glorious new city skyline, and a maze of superhighways, but the river has been forgotten. On the east side the Hartford Yacht Club bravely faces the river, with no docks and few moorings. Past the Bulkeley Bridge there is no channel and scarcely enough water for a rowboat during the summer. The nearest that yachts can anchor is in Wethersfield Cove.

Worse, has been man's abuse of the river. It has earned the soiled reputation of being dirty, smelly, and unfit for man, fish, or bird. Being the downstream State, Connecticut inevitably receives the waste of its three neighboring States to the north. According to the State health commissioner, "the river hasn't been fit for swimming for 50 years." "Fair, noble, glorious river" has now become labeled "the world's most beautifully landscaped cesspool."

Our gravest natural problem, pollution, has reduced the available water supply and restricted recreational development. Almost too late, public agencies, prodded by private conservation groups like the Connecticut River Watershed Council, are taking corrective action that will require 10 years to complete and will cost millions of dollars. One important phase is the installation of adequate treatment plants. Like the new one serving Farmington, they must be designed to remove up to 90 percent of human waste before it reaches our streams.

Equally critical is the discharge of organic industrial wastes—now double the amount of human sewage. Other pollution hazards that must be controlled are synthetic chemicals and detergents, radioactive materials, dumps, heated water emptied by industry, pesticides, and even recreational activities.

Far more than most residents realize, the river is still vital to agriculture, industry, and power. For example, tobacco. Using river water to irrigate the narrow strip of unique sandy soil along its banks, Yankee farmers produce \$30 million worth of the Indian weed annually. Tobacco has been raised in the Connecticut Valley on a commercial scale for 140 years. Shaped like an elephant's ear, green in the field but brown after harvest, growing 10 feet tall, most of it is used for binders and wrappers in cigars. Called Long Nines, they were first made in South Windsor.

Connecticut Shade tobacco is now generally accepted as the best cigar wrapper in the world. After many experiments growers in Poquonock discovered, at the turn of the century, that under the shade of cloth they could create the necessary tropical atmosphere found in the East Indies. Nine thousand acres are planted yearly under the white and yellow cheesecloth. Nearly 5,000 full-time workers are employed, as well as more than 16,000 summer helpers. In large barn or curing sheds begins the 8-week drying process.

Industry uses millions of gallons of river water daily for cooling and processing. United Aircraft's Willgoos Laboratory, the

feldspar plant below Middletown, the Hartford Electric Light Co. power station nearby. This coal-fueled plant now generates six times more electricity than when it opened in 1953.

The need for power by Connecticut's people, who will soon number 3 million, is almost insatiable. In the next decade alone the demand will equal the total amount provided in the past 80 years. To satisfy this, several New England utilities have formed the Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Co. At a cost of \$100 million they are now building the State's first nuclear power facility at Haddam Neck. For cooling purposes 372,000 gallons of heated water will be discharged every minute into the river—a requirement that has caused conservationists to fear for the survival of the shad and other fish in water temperatures that may, during the summer, exceed 100° F.

Surprisingly, our river industry is still served by the New Haven Railroad. The Valley Line from Middletown to Essex operates twice weekly, and one clear fall day we bought a ticket at the Middletown depot, met the crew and climbed aboard. The little freight train weaved close to the river over a bed that has become so bumpy that the maximum speed limit has been reduced to 20 miles per hour. But from the diesel cab we saw a unique panorama. On through the straits the train rumbled along until it reached the white piles of feldspar. Then past the Heico power station, with its vast mound of coal brought in by 95-car trains. To Higginum where railroad ties are cut, and opposite Goodspeed's Landing to the East Haddam lumber and hardware store. Farther down, whistling by the private crossings, we glimpsed marinas with their canvas-covered hulls, drydocked for the winter. At Deep River the engine was reversed and all hands gathered in the dining car—a caboose—for a hot lunch. Then, the return journey home over the single track in the soft light of an autumn afternoon.

More essential to Connecticut River industry than the railroad is the river highway itself, and the tugboats, barges, and tankers that ply it daily the year around. Some 34,000 vessels annually bring 3 million tons of cargo upriver, an increase of 25 percent in the past decade. Fuel oil accounts for more than one-half of the products carried, followed by gas, coal, kerosene, jet fuel, and petroleum asphalt.

The U.S. Corps of Army Engineers is responsible for maintaining a 15-foot controlling depth from Saybrook to Hartford. Frequently the channel must be dredged of the silt that inexorably accumulates. Sometimes river silt is used for fill, as in the construction of this interstate highway near Middletown.

The Coast Guard sees that more than 100 navigation lights are kept in working order, including, since 1839, the sentinel guarding the mouth. In winter, it must also free the channel of ice, so that barges and tankers can get through with their precious cargoes of oil and coal for Connecticut homes. Several times icebreakers, like the *Mahoning*, must be dispatched from New York.

With the snow falling hard and storm signals flying from Eastport, Maine to New York City, we boarded the tug at East Haddam. Under the command of Captain Miller, *Mahoning* is 110 feet long. With her 8-foot stainless steel prop she can easily slice through 2 feet of ice. On this stormy morning ice 4 inches thick had formed in the river at various points, and we set a course upstream to clear a passage. She crunched along with an occasional shudder of her hull. Once or twice her 12-foot draft caused her to scrape bottom. Despite the weather we sighted several empty tankers on their return passage. The thickest ice is usually found between Goodspeed's Landing and Gildersleeve above the Middletown Bridge,

where the channel is especially narrow. In addition to keeping the channel open, *Mahoning* tries to prevent blocks of ice from building up at the sharp bends and to free vessels that become stuck.

A leading conservationist, William Whyte, says: "With the explosive growth in boating that is ahead, the river is going to become a great recreation highway." New roads and bridges are providing more access to the river. Already, our State has 100,000 pleasure craft. Boating is recognized as the No. 1 family sport. Along the river are 10 public launching sites, with more to come, 8 yacht clubs, 3 State parks, 25 marinas and shipyards, most of them below Middletown.

Army Engineers are embarking on a 2-year study of the need for dredging a small boat channel along the 32 miles from Hartford to Holyoke. At the same time they will make a 5-year probe of the entire Connecticut River Basin to determine its future potential for boating, fishing and even swimming. Someday it may be open to as many as 2 million summer vacationers.

Fishing the Connecticut and its tributaries for bass, perch, herring, shad, and other varieties, is happily on the increase, although no longer do salmon populate its depths. In colonial times they were so plentiful that bondservants could not be fed salmon more than thrice weekly; and shad, which sold for as little as a penny each, were good only for fertilizing the cornfields. Over 100,000 shad a year are now caught, a multimillion-dollar investment for commercial and sport fishermen.

There are encouraging new signs of the river being used for the sports and pleasures of yesteryear. Trinity College crews once again row and race between Bulkeley Bridge and the Canoe Club. Recalling steamboat days, the *Dolly Madison* cruises twice daily between Hartford and Middletown. The *Holly*, out of Essex, gives landlubbers, a look at the watery secrets of Selden's Creek and the bygone splendor of the Haddams, where river captains built their homes above the banks. And the River Ramble, started by the Watershed Council, is now in its sixth year.

Between the mouth and Essex the marshlands remain a naturalist's paradise, even though two-thirds of the area have disappeared before the onslaught of civilization. Here washed twice a day by salty tides, muskrat scamper through waist-high grasses and bulrushes. Wild ducks and a few heron and osprey are seasonal guests and sometimes hatch their young. At least 16 species of fish feed here, as well as wild swans.

For protection, the State has been acquiring key parcels of wetlands in the lower river. But man cannot cease his encroachment. The North Cove, for instance, is a shallow blind inlet almost surrounded by tidal marshes. With Federal funds, it has been dredged to provide an anchorage for 200 small boats.

An ancient writer held that the same man cannot step twice into the same river, because both change. So, too, have the Connecticut and man's use of it changed through 350 years. No longer is its water, in Timothy Dwight's phrase, "everywhere pure, potable, perfectly salubrious."

It has also been said that a river, like a woman, is all the things she has ever been. The Connecticut winds through land that is still two-thirds forested and one-quarter farmed. Despite abuse, despite neglect, its banks are relatively unspoiled. It is still a tremendous resource for power, industry, commerce, and recreation.

In our age beauty and progress often conflict. On the one hand, the desperate quest to conserve what little of nature remains unspoiled on the other, the unquenchable demand to develop open areas. The challenge for Connecticut is to balance these needs, so as to preserve the "last beautiful river" for us who have despoiled it—for our

25148

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

October 5, 1965

children who must someday again drink from its life giving flow. Then we can say that ours is, in Biblical words, the pure river of the water of life, clear as crystal.

SIGNING OF THE IMMIGRATION ACT BY PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, under the upraised arm of the Statue of Liberty, President Johnson on Sunday, October 3, 1965, signed the Immigration Act and thereby reestablished the traditional American concept of justice in addition to serving our self-interest.

For four decades the standards of the national origins quota system have forced mothers to choose between their children and America, kept from this Nation the skills and talents we needed and set up the false criterion that men born in one place were somehow better than men born in another place.

Under the new immigration law there has been created a system of selecting immigrants based not on the accident of where they were born—or even where their forebears were born—but on the basis of reuniting families and on the basis of special talents and skills which the immigrant can contribute to our special needs.

The new law does not permit the immigration of those who would threaten the jobs or livelihood of Americans nor of those who would be likely prospects for the relief rolls. And the skills which would give them a preference must be in short supply, or of unusual benefit to this Nation.

The new law allows for the admission of up to 10,000 refugees a year from Communist or other forms of persecution and from natural disasters, continuing what has been the traditional humane policy of America to those afflicted.

In addition, the new law continues the safeguards we have used for many years to bar criminals, addicts, subversives, and other undesirables.

In its practical operation, the national origins quota system kept out of this country about 50,000 qualified immigrants a year who now would be permitted to enter the United States. That is, of course, an insignificant number for a country of our size and wealth. And it is virtually unnoticeable in comparison with our population growth of some 3 million each year.

Primarily, the act is designed not to generate increases but to wipe out injustices, of which there have been many.

Under the old law, some large-quota countries consistently failed to use all of their annual quota allotments, but at the same time the law would not permit these quota numbers to be used by countries which had waiting lists. Thus at least one-third of the total authorized quota numbers were wasted each year. Such was the result of an offensive theory that presumed that some people were inferior solely because of their birth-places.

Consider an American with a mother in Greece. Under the old system, he would have had to wait at least 5 years—often longer—to obtain a visa which would permit her to join him here.

Similarly the American citizen with a brother or sister or married child in Italy could not secure a visa without waiting for years.

Immigrants from favored countries, with no family ties and no particular skills to offer this country, could, in cruel contrast, enter without difficulty or delay.

The same American citizen whose mother would have to wait 5 years could bring in a domestic servant from the United Kingdom or Ireland in from 4 to 6 weeks. If he chose one from Sweden, Belgium, or Germany, the waiting period was only a little longer—from 8 to 12 weeks.

This was the system endured by this Nation for four decades. It viewed men not as individuals but as part of a mass. The new law corrects that view.

The old system deprived this Nation of the persons whose skills would have been of inestimable value. Many cases existed like that of the American hospital which was urgently in need of the services of the young, brilliant surgeon engaged in important research in heart surgery in India. Despite his top preference, the tiny Indian quota of 100 was filled. It would have taken years before he could be admitted.

Finally, the national origins system created an image of hypocrisy easily exploited by those who would blacken our stated beliefs in democracy. For example, it required persons of Asian stock to be assigned to quota areas not by their place of birth but by their racial ancestry.

Thus a husband with a half-Chinese wife could come to this country but would have to leave her for 5 years until he could achieve citizenship.

These and other anomalies have been abolished. The new law sets up a simple standard. We will admit those who have relatives in this country or whose skills we need, and we will do so without regard to the country of their birth. We shall choose among these people on the basis of first come, first served.

Since we cannot admit all who want to come to our land, we must be true to our own ideals in deciding who may enter. The new law embodies those ideals. Fairness is the keynote. Discrimination is ended.

RECESS TO TOMORROW

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 6, 1965, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 5 (legislative day of October 1), 1965:

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Bernard L. Boutin, of New Hampshire, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

U.S. MARSHAL

Joseph F. Novak, of Delaware, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Delaware for the term of 4 years, vice Edward J. Hussey, deceased.

Emilio Naranjo, of New Mexico, to be U.S. marshal for the district of New Mexico for the term of 4 years, vice Dave Fresquez, retired.

George E. O'Brien, of California, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of California for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Thomas W. Sorrell, of Vermont, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Vermont for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

POSTMASTERS

The following named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

Vernon M. Livingston, Mansfield, Ark., in place of R. W. Barger, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Andrew Chemycz, Crockett, Calif., in place of L. T. Gray, retired.

Leon Kulekjan, Parlier, Calif., in place of J. E. Alfors, retired.

Raymond A. Brandt, Santa Rosa, Calif., in place of H. M. Schulze, retired.

COLORADO

Rallin R. Gibson, Collbran, Colo., in place of E. N. Adams, retired.

CONNECTICUT

Francis I. Welles, Washington Depot, Conn., in place of L. P. Gage, resigned.

Adolph J. Wojcik, Willimantic, Conn., in place of J. J. Lee, retired.

GEORGIA

Charles C. Polndexter, Jr., Ellijay, Ga., in place of R. C. Stenbridge, retired.

ILLINOIS

Matthew J. Vlscum, Lockport, Ill., in place of J. S. West, retired.

Norman A. Rutter, Saint Libary, Ill., in place of C. S. Rutter, retired.

INDIANA

J. Maxwell Clouse, Nappanee, Ind., in place of L. M. Roose, retired.

Lloyd G. Schroeder, Wheeler, Ind., in place of F. A. Smith, retired.

KANSAS

Wayne A. Wray, Barnes, Kans., in place of J. T. Poland, retired.

KENTUCKY

Maxine D. Remley, Silver Grove, Ky., in place of E. G. Abbott, retired.

LOUISIANA

Marilyn B. Coco, Hamburg, La., in place of M. C. Beridon, retired.

MAINE

Orville B. Denison, Jr., Cornish, Maine, in place of G. B. Haley, retired.

MARYLAND

Irrington R. Davidson, California, Md., in place of R. K. Barefoot, deceased.

Thelma Willburn, Gambrills, Md., in place of C. L. Miller, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Joseph L. Lemleux, North Brookfield, Mass., in place of J. H. Short, retired.

MICHIGAN

Paul H. Mominee, Dundee, Mich., in place of E. M. Potter, retired.

MISSOURI

Lawrence P. Cook, California, Mo., in place of A. P. Carr, retired.

Donald H. McConnell, Greenfield, Mo., in place of Hazel Ryals, retired.

MONTANA

Wallace W. Paterson, Livingston, Mont., in place of F. I. Adams, retired.

October 5, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

25061

economic policies in Africa, to make them consistent and credible and thus responsive to our national interest in the development of stable and viable African states.

IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1965

(Mr. BRADEMAS (at the request of Mr. Boggs) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 3, 1965, I had the privilege, along with other Members of Congress and interested citizens, of standing in the shadow of the Statue of Liberty as President Johnson signed into law the Immigration Act recently passed by Congress.

As the only Member of Congress of Greek descent and as the first native-born American of Greek origin ever to serve in Congress, I naturally was very proud to be present for this historic occasion. It was just over half a century that my father emigrated from Greece to the United States in order to become an American citizen.

In signing the Immigration Act of 1965 into law, President Johnson lifted a veil of hypocrisy from the face of that grand old lady that had rested there for 41 years.

In those 4 decades we Americans have said "Give us your tired, your poor, your huddled masses." But what we have really meant was: "Give us your immigrants of Northern European ancestry."

This is the year in which that hypocrisy at last was conquered, the year of triumph for the reform of the national origins system on which our immigration laws were based.

The new immigration law creates a system of selecting immigrants based not on the accident of where they were born—or even where their ancestors were born—but on the basis of reuniting relatives with families who live here, or on the basis of the special talents or skills which an immigrant can contribute to meet our special needs.

None of these immigrants will be admitted if they threaten the jobs or livelihood of Americans, or if they are prospects for welfare roles. The skills which will qualify them for a preference are those proven to be in short supply, or of unusual benefit.

The new law also provides for admitting up to 10,000 refugees a year from Communist or other forms of persecution and from natural disasters, thereby continuing the traditional humane American policy to these unfortunates.

Strict safeguards under the new law will exclude criminals, addicts, subversives, and other undesirables.

The act does not materially increase the total volume of immigration into this country over and above the volume which has been authorized under the preceding law. However, since the practical operation of the national origins system kept out about 50,000 qualified immigrants a year within the total that was authorized, abolition of that system may result in an actual increase in immigration of up to 50,000 a year.

Even that number is microscopic for a country of our size and wealth, where natural growth accounts for more than 60 times that number.

The principal result of the act thus is not to generate increases, but to overcome injustices—and they have been great.

For example, an American citizen with a mother in Greece has had to wait for 5 years—sometimes longer—to obtain the visa permitting her to join him here. An American citizen who had a brother or a sister or married child in Italy likewise had a wait of many years to get a visa.

In contrast to this cruel policy, the same American citizen could bring in a domestic servant from the United Kingdom or Ireland in from 4 to 6 weeks. If he chose one from Sweden, Belgium or Germany, the waiting period was from 8 to 12 weeks.

Put in another way, an American citizen could bring in a total stranger to be his maid in a few weeks, but to bring his mother might take him 5 years.

For 41 years this was the system that this Nation endured, a system which clearly implied that one man's country would necessarily make him a better American than another's. The new immigration reform act corrects that implication.

In addition, the national origins systems deprived us of persons whose skills would have been of the greatest value to this country. There were many cases like that of the American hospital which urgently sought the services of a brilliant surgeon from India who had done important research in heart surgery. But India's quota was only 100. He had to wait years before he could be admitted. This no longer will be true.

Finally, this old system created an image of hypocrisy which was exploited by those who would blacken our stated beliefs in democracy. It provided, for example, that persons of Asian birth were not even assigned to quotas on the basis of their places of birth, but according to that of their racial ancestors. It affected a young man in Colombia who was eligible to come here quite easily because he lived in an independent Western Hemisphere country. His wife also was a native and a citizen of Colombia. But she had a Chinese father and so had to be considered half Chinese. It meant she had to come in under the Chinese quota of 105.

If her husband had chosen to come to the United States alone and achieved citizenship in 5 years she would have been allowed to join him—after 5 long years. Or, if he wanted to come here with her, the wait would have been a little longer—until the year 2048.

Under the old system there was a mandatory provision which inflicted harsh cruelties. It is best illustrated by the case of the young man of Italian descent who met and married an Italian girl while serving with the U.S. Navy in the Mediterranean. They had a daughter, an American citizen by reason of her father's citizenship. The Navy recently gave the young father a new assignment in the United States and he made plans

to take his family along. But he could not do so.

Why? Because several years before, the wife was hospitalized with a nervous breakdown. She recovered fully and was discharged. But under the old law, mental disability, whether in the past or in the present, was the mandatory basis for permanent exclusion from the United States. It paid no attention to medical advances in the treatment of mental disturbances.

It was a Solomon-like decision the young father faced. He could leave his wife and child in Italy. Or he could leave the Navy and give up living in this country to live with his family abroad. The new law makes unnecessary such heart-breaking decisions.

The national origins quota system inflicted that kind of penalty. This was the kind of injustice which President Johnson last spring asked Congress to bury by passing this immigration reform bill. To its credit, and the Nation's pride, this request is now a reality.

DEDICATION OF THE 100 HOUSES OF JARDINES VIRU IN LIMA, PERU

(Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. Boggs) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I recently participated in the dedication of the first 100 homes of a great 900-home housing project being built in Peru by an outstanding American businessman, Mr. Haim Eliachar. As the distinguished President of Peru, His Excellency Fernando Belaunde Terry, whom Mrs. Pepper and I were accompanying, was inspecting the new homes, a citizen of Callao—in the vicinity of Lima—who became a happy owner of one of these attractive homes, respectfully stopped the presidential party and read to the President a beautiful address expressing his gratitude and the gratitude of other homeowners that these homes had been made available to them.

This great project, made possible by Mr. Haim Eliachar and his companies with a loan made by the Bankers Life Corp. of Iowa and guaranteed by our AID program and the cooperation of the Peruvian Government, is a splendid example of what the Alliance for Progress program is doing to make life better for the people in Latin America. This eloquent address by one of the homeowners, Senor Elias E. Caverro Sifuentes, is typical of the gratitude that the people feel in their hearts for what we are doing under this program.

I include it at this point in the Record:

In representation of the proprietors of the [housing] development, Jardines Viru, I welcome you on the occasion of the official inauguration of this flowering development which, with the cooperation of the Alliance for Progress, affords us the opportunity to become proprietors of our homes, a desire for which we have hoped for with all of our hearts and which, today, is honored by your presence and that of the distinguished persons who honor us in this transcendental act in the life of this growing development, Jar-

25062

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 5, 1965

dines Viru, which you, Mr. Constitutional President of the Republic, declared officially inaugurated a few moments ago.

For this reason, upon receiving from your hands, Mr. Constitutional President of the Republic, the symbolic keys which convert us into the proprietors of our own homes, we are jubilant and our hearts, and those of our families, present here, are filled with joy and happiness, for which we are deeply indebted to you.

Mr. President, please accept this modest homage.

HEART DISEASE, CANCER, AND STROKE

(Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. Boggs) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to point out that the last week in September brought to fruition a proud moment for the U.S. Congress even though no banner headlines announced this act. For when Senator LISTER HILL rose on the floor of the Senate to urge that body to adopt the House version of the Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke Amendments of 1965, and when subsequently the Senate concurred with the House, sending the bill to the President, we had pretty well rounded out the health legislation outlined in the President's health message of January 7, 1965. It seemed to me to be particularly appropriate, I might add, that Senator HILL handled this bill for I know, from long experience of working with him in the field of health legislation in the Senate, how deeply he has been concerned during his long and distinguished career with improving the health of the American people.

Looking back to the 1940's I am gratified to say that this Congress has also moved in the direction of rounding out at least two decades of effort to improve the health of all of our people. Sometimes it has been a discouraging job—but persistence has also had its rewards. Through the years we have begun to demonstrate a growing concern for better health for our youth—which means better health for later life—and better health for our aged people; with strengthening the numbers and skills of people in our health professions; and with improvements in our medical research, particularly to help conquer particular diseases. We have had some successes in our attacks on disease. Smallpox, malaria, yellow fever, and typhus are conquered in this country. Poliomyelitis, which took 3,154 lives so recently as 1952, cost only 5 lives in 1964. Death rates for influenza have been reduced by 88 percent during the past 20 years. But there remain to be conquered what are now the most deadly killers of them all—cancer, heart disease, stroke, and their related afflictions.

I think it is important to realize that the Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke Amendments of 1965 represent our recognition that we must always be ready to try new approaches to hard problems, rather than a sudden awareness that these problem areas exist. They are a new form of attack which will supplement earlier efforts in the hope that, somehow, we will find the breakthrough.

The new approach will seek to bring about the cooperation of medical schools, clinical research institutions, and hospitals so that the latest advances in the care of patients suffering from heart disease, stroke, cancer, and related diseases may be made available, through planned programs of research, training, and continuing education, and related demonstrations of patient care. It recognizes that the best patient care is usually associated with research and that prompt and precise exchange and dissemination of findings among people in the health field must also be encouraged, and may be as important as work in the quiet laboratory.

I do not need to remind the Congress that this is but the most recent form of attack because, beginning back in 1937 when the National Cancer Institute was established, the Federal Government first showed its concern with this most cruel disease. It was one of the first ventures of the Federal Government into the field of health outside of the regular public health activities. And it was established at a time when the country was working its way out of a depression on the one hand, and faced with a decision as to its role in the world increasingly concerned with Hitler's Germany on the other. With our involvement in a world war in 1941, it is understandable that practically all efforts of Government were turned toward the war effort. Nevertheless I like to think that the investigations I was able to conduct at that time of the health status of our young men as revealed by selective service data first awakened the country to some of the serious health problems we faced in this country. With the cooperation of the Army and other military officials, the Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education of the Senate's Committee on Education and Labor, manned by a very able and bipartisan group of Senators and a fine staff, found in 1945, after 2½ years of study, that of the 22 million men of military age, 40 percent could not meet the requirements of general military service. It was only a first step—an effort to find better information than we then had as to the state of health of one segment of our population—our young men who could be presumed to be among our healthiest Americans. But the country was shocked at the figures. I have always been particularly proud of the fact that President Truman, in his health message to Congress on November 19, 1945, used the findings of the so-called Pepper subcommittee in the opening paragraphs of this great message outlining a broad-scale program of postwar action.

One line of action recommended in this message will be more fully realized by the enactment of the heart, stroke, and cancer bill of 1965 when it is signed into law. For, in his postwar message 20 years ago, President Truman stressed the importance of research as one means of achieving his health goals. With reference to the particular problem with which this legislation is concerned, he said:

Cancer is one of the leading causes of death. Though we already have the National

Cancer Institute of the Public Health Service, we need still more coordinated research on the cause, prevention, and cure of this disease. We need more financial support for research and to establish special clinics and hospitals for diagnosis and treatment of the disease especially in its early stages.

In 1947, 2 years later, I introduced a bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place or places in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts and to coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover new means of treating, curing, and preventing diseases of the heart and arteries. And in the following year we were able to bring about the establishment of the National Heart Institute under the provisions of S. 2215, which was introduced by Senators Bridges, Ives, Murray, and myself, in February 1948.

It was not the easiest legislation to enact in spite of its bipartisan support. The Budget Bureau, I recall, sent an unfavorable report. But finally it was signed into public law on June 16, 1948.

But it is not enough just to establish an institute. Two things are essential in such an undertaking: getting people of the highest professional and administrative competence to run them and providing them with adequate funds. The latter function is the particular job of the Congress and I have always believed I had as great an obligation to see that, to the extent of my ability and effort, these funds were forthcoming.

Satisfied with the high quality of people brought in to establish the new Heart Institute and with the caliber of the people administering the National Cancer Institute, I set for myself the task of helping to provide adequate funds for them. It, too, was not always easy. In 1948, for example, I had hoped for an appropriation of \$6,740,000 for the Heart Institute in the Second Deficiency Appropriations Act—H.R. 6935. The House Report—No. 2348—on June 15, called for no appropriation whatsoever. The Senate report on June 18 was a little better in calling for \$1 million. The conference split the difference to provide a meager \$500,000 and this was the amount enacted into law by Public Law 785 on June 25, 1948.

In connection with the appropriations for the following fiscal year—H.R. 5728—things went a little better. I had expressed the hope that we should spend \$3,300,000 on heart research. The Senate and the House agreed on the somewhat lower figure of \$2,282,000 and this amount was authorized. As to research on cancer my request for at least \$14 million for the upcoming year was accepted by both the House and the Senate and enacted into law.

And so it went each year—a little chipped off, but a little more money.

Today, support for these activities by the American people, from these small beginnings, is revealed by the fact that total expenditures for the National Cancer Institute in fiscal 1964 were some \$70,692,000 largely for research, fellowships, and training and direct operation, and an even larger amount of \$117,404,-

October 5, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

25063

000 for the same year—and for the same purposes—went for the National Heart Institute.

The Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke Amendments of 1965 will draw upon the experience gained in these programs—upon the knowledge gained not only in the direction of promising avenues of future research but, equally important, upon the knowledge gained of what had seemed hopeful but now seem to be fruitless avenues of exploration.

As I have said, the Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke Amendments of 1965 represent a new auxiliary attack on these diseases which threaten so many Americans and have so stubbornly resisted the detection of the final answer we have been able to find in other areas of disease.

The President has pointed out that 48 million people now living will become victims of cancer, and that heart disease and strokes will continue to account for more than half of the deaths in the United States each year unless we can master these scourges. The new proposal rests on the recent recommendations of the DeBakey Commission. This report emphasizes the point that we have reached the time when findings do not call exclusively for a one-man show directed from Washington, but also for a cooperative national effort in the field involving health leaders, voluntary organizations, and State and local governments as well as health agencies. As a veteran of the war on disease, I am happy and proud to have had a part in the development of this legislation. Like earlier health legislation, it is not all I had hoped for. But it has been enacted by the Congress—and the beginning to a breakthrough, we can all hope and trust, has been made.

IMMIGRATION ACT

(Mrs. MINK (at the request of Mr. Boggs) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, with the Statue of Liberty holding high her torch nearby, President Johnson on October 3, 1965, signed the new Immigration Act, one of the most important acts of this Congress and the administration.

When recommending this legislation earlier in the year, the President urged the Congress to return the United States to an immigration policy which serves the national interest and continues our traditional ideals. He stated:

No move could more effectively reaffirm our fundamental belief that a man is to be judged—and judged exclusively—on his worth as a human being.

In responding favorably to the President's request Congress has enacted a law which abolishes the discriminatory national origins system of allocating immigrant visas on the basis of an individual's place of birth and substitutes a sensible, fair, humane and nondiscriminatory system, available on a first-come, first-served basis.

Under the new system meaning and significance is given to preferences in the

issuance of immigrant visas to persons having close family relationships to citizens and lawfully resident aliens. Under the system as it existed prior to the enactment of the administration's legislation the preferences accorded to close family members of citizens or lawfully resident aliens were largely ineffective because such preferences operated only within each separate quota area and thus meant little if anything to immigrants from low-quota countries. Under the new law all countries are afforded their fair share of the quota. The needless and prolonged separation of family members is thus avoided, particularly with respect to relatives who do not qualify for exemption from numerical quota limitations.

It was possible under the old system for an American citizen to bring to this country without appreciable delay a total stranger, from a high-quota country, for employment as a domestic, while at the same time the operations of the system could require years of waiting before he could bring in an aging parent who was a native of a low-quota country. Under the new law parents of citizens will not be subject to any numerical quota limitation.

The new immigration law also will serve to prevent the separation of families occasioned by the absolute prohibition in the old law with respect to the admission of aliens who are mentally retarded or who had a past history of mental illness. The old law did not take into account the medical advances which have been made in the treatment of mental illnesses. As a result there were many cases where close relatives of citizens or lawfully resident aliens were prevented from joining their families in this country even though they had been cured of their illnesses or such illnesses were medically controllable. The new law changed this heartless, cruel policy.

One especially worthwhile reform in the new law is the repeal of the so-called Asia-Pacific triangle provision. This provision defined a geographical area in the Far East which included practically the entire continent of Asia, and any immigrant with as much as one-half of his ancestry from this area was treated differently. All other immigrants were charged to the quotas of the countries where they were born, but a man born in England who lived in England all his life and never had left England would be counted as Asiatic if two of his four grandparents had come from Asia. The great majority of Asian countries had the minimum annual quota of 100, because they had relatively few inhabitants in the United States in 1920 who traced their origin to that part of the world. These token quotas had long waiting lists, and as a result the Englishmen would be kept out for many years because of his grandparents, while other Englishmen entered freely.

The hardships which ensued are also illustrated by the following example: A family consisted of a white father born in Argentina, his wife who was half Japanese, and their infant child, all born in Argentina. Although the father and the

child were entitled to enter as natives of an independent Western Hemisphere country, the wife had to be charged to the oversubscribed quota for Japan. This would normally prevent the family from emigrating, but in some cases it caused a separation of the family. This type of discrimination is now ended, and the whole family will be treated as Argentinians.

The elimination of the discriminatory treatment of the Asia-Pacific triangle is but one of the more dramatic accomplishments of the new act. It will serve in many ways to fill urgent needs in terms of simple humanity, in terms of our self-interest at home, and in terms of our self-interest abroad.

For two decades we have operated our immigration laws under the warped standards of the national origins quota system. The time had long since passed for their replacement. The new standards which the Congress and the President have fashioned for the Nation are fair and carry out our ideals of fairness and democracy. They will serve us well.

HAWAIIAN SUGAR HISTORY

(Mrs. MINK (at the request of Mr. Boggs) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, this week the House of Representatives will be considering H.R. 11135, the Sugar Act Amendments of 1965. In order to inform my colleagues of this House of the importance of sugar to my State of Hawaii I would like to present the following brief history.

Hawaii's sugar industry has been one of the great success stories of our Nation, to the point where not only is sugar the largest industry of our islands, but Hawaii is the major sugar producing State of the Nation.

Hawaii's eight principal islands comprise 8,423 square miles, slightly larger than Connecticut and Rhode Island combined. Only about one-twelfth of this area is suitable for agriculture, and only four of the islands produce sugarcane.

Even now, some 231,000 acres comprise the total cane-land area. Yet that area is so productive, and the application of scientific agriculture is so intense, that slightly more than 100,000 acres of cane harvested each year now provide more than 10 million tons of cane and more than 1,100,000 tons of sugar. These are record high yields for the sugar-growing areas of the world.

Hawaiian production represents roughly 2 percent of world production and more than one-tenth of U.S. consumption. About \$200 million of capital has been invested in this major industry of the islands since World War II, and returns to the economy in 1963 were about \$188 million. The annual payroll, going to about 13,000 year-around employees, is in excess of \$60 million. Applied scientific technology, mechanization, high yields per acre, and exceptional pay per hour for labor are

25064

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 5, 1965

characteristics which make the Hawaiian sugar industry outstanding in comparison with mainland production or with that of other countries in the world.

Sugarcane is an old, old story in Hawaii. Apparently it was brought to these islands either at the time of original settlement, perhaps as early as A.D. 500, or during the period down to about A.D. 1300 when voyages to and from Tahiti were thought to have continued. Botanists hold that it was 1 of 25 plants introduced in ancient times.

When Captain Cook discovered the islands in 1778 he noted "several plantations of sugarcane" growing on high ground. However, no sugar was made from the cane. It apparently was used as a kind of hedge around garden patches, and pieces were broken off and chewed for their sweet sap.

It has been said that all beginnings are difficult. This certainly was true for sugar production in Hawaii. During the first quarter of the 19th century, references to sugar production in the islands were fleeting. There was some experimentation in 1802 by Chinese, who tried to produce sugar on the island of Lanai with a crude granite roller and a few boiling pans. Lanai even today is not productive of sugar.

A few individual attempts to manufacture sugar were noted including that of an Italian resident, who in 1823 made sugar by pounding cane with stone beaters on the boards used by Hawaiians for making poi and then boiling the juice down to crystals.

It took severe tests and several failures before sugar was firmly established in the second quarter of the century, and great labor and infinite ingenuity to establish and extend the first cane plantations.

In 1825, John Wilkinson, an Englishman, set out a small cane plantation. Although he was dead by 1827, the juice of his first cane crop was converted to rum—at which the royal government ordered that the plantation's still be broken, its cane plowed under, and the land planted to sweet potatoes.

Three young New Englanders incorporated themselves as Ladd & Co. in 1835 and set out to produce sugar on 980 acres of land they leased from the Hawaiian king for 50 years at \$300 a year. They went bankrupt, although about a third of their tract has since proved to be good cane land. Their plantation, Koloa on the island of Kauai, proved to be Hawaii's first permanent plantation. It exported 4,286 pounds of sugar and 2,700 gallons of molasses in 1837 and was finally merged with another plantation. Truly, the adventure of producing sugar in Hawaii in those days was not for the fainthearted.

There was perserverance, however.

By 1838, there were 20 small sugar mills in operation in the islands, of which 18 were animal powered and two were waterpowered. During the California gold rush, sugar prices rose to as much as 20 cents a pound, and Hawaii, in 1851, exported 162 tons of sugar.

From this small beginning, the development of Hawaii's sugar industry was rapid during the third quarter of the 19th century. Even then, mechanical improvements through the use of modern technology were a major factor.

The first sugar centrifugal, perhaps the most significant invention in the history of the sugar industry, was introduced; it separated sugar crystals from molasses by its whirling action. The first steam engine was installed in 1853 and the first steam mill in 1857. Exports climbed to 913 tons in 1859, then declined to 722 tons in the next year.

But the introduction of the vacuum pan in 1863, together with the stimulus provided by the vast Civil War market in the United States, resulted in exports of 8,869 tons in 1866. Thereafter, production trended sharply upward, except for a few drought years.

The fascination of the establishment of this new enterprise attracted a wide diversity of pioneers. Among them were young New Englanders, the sons of early missionaries to Hawaii, American sea captains, the son of a president of Norway, Irishmen, Englishmen, and Germans. They included bookkeepers and bankers as well as others with agricultural backgrounds.

As the need for labor grew in the burgeoning industry, 300 Chinese arrived from Hong Kong in 1852, to be followed by 500 more in 1865. This was the start of a long line of immigrants to the islands, called to work in the sugar fields and mills.

It is estimated that 46,000 Chinese migrated to Hawaii between 1864 and 1900, of whom 8,000 came from the mainland United States rather than directly from China. More than half came unassisted, and slightly more than half of them returned home after fulfilling their contracts. The others tended to congregate in Hawaii's urban areas, and it was estimated that 14,000 of the 20,000 Chinese in Hawaii in 1886 were in Honolulu, either in trade or raising truck vegetables in small farms just outside the city proper.

Japanese migration began in 1868, when the Hawaiian consul in Japan arranged for 148 laborers to come to Hawaii. It was 20 years before others followed them, however.

Rapid expansion of Hawaiian sugar production continued through the final quarter of the 19th century. After unsuccessful attempts in 1848 and 1852, the Hawaiian Government succeeded in ne-

gotiating a reciprocity treaty with the United States in 1876. That trade agreement admitted sugar duty free to the American consumer market.

Subsequently, land for sugar cane was substantially increased by the use of irrigation on four of the islands; and the irrigation also increased the reliable productivity of the land on which it was used.

The first and most famous irrigation project in Hawaii was the Hamakua Ditch, which was 17 miles long and capable of moving 40 million gallons of water a day. It was built by Alexander and Baldwin, sons of early American missionaries, at a cost of \$80,000, to tap the rainfall of nearby mountains to water their then barren plantation in the hot but dry lowland plain of central Maui.

This success prompted the California capitalist Spreckels to build another ditch on Maui, this one 30 miles long and capable of delivering 50 million gallons of water daily.

Subsequent irrigation projects involved great tunnels through mountains, miles and miles of pipes, inverted siphons, large reservoirs, and even portable ditches. Water from wells for irrigation started in 1879, when the first artesian well was put down. Eventually, hundreds of pump and well combinations dotted the drier cane areas of the islands, providing hundreds of millions of gallons of water daily.

The efforts to irrigate also spotlight the growing importance of the use of science to increase productivity. The irrigated lands were assured of reliable growth conditions for a large segment of the acreage growing cane. Breeding work resulted in new cane varieties which yielded higher tonnage per acre and juice with a greater sugar content than the original varieties. Chemists were employed by the industry. Commercial fertilizers were introduced. As a result, the first 100,000-ton sugar crop was produced in 1886, to be followed by the first 250,000-ton crop only 11 years later.

Meanwhile, the sugar industry's labor needs continued to feed the famous Hawaiian melting pot. Portuguese immigrant families had arrived in 1878, mostly from the island and Madeira. German immigrants followed them in 1881. After formal arrangements were made between the governments in 1885, the major Japanese immigration began in earnest. By 1907, more than 180,000 Japanese had come to Hawaii to work, of whom about 126,000 had left to return home. By 1913, the number of Portuguese immigrants had swelled to 20,000 men, women, and children, with the majority of them again coming from Portugal's island provinces.

Senate

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1965

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President. Rev. Kenneth S. Jones, director, Washington area Methodist information, Silver Spring, Md., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, whose we are and in whose hands the nations of the world have their hope of security and peace, bless, we pray, the labors of this day, by these Thy servants so heavily charged with the general welfare of all in this land, and so strategically situated as to influence the destiny of the human race by their every act. Thou alone art Lord and God. We are mere men, Thy servants, seeking to do that which will be pleasing in Thy sight. Endow us and all men with wisdom from on high, enough for the responsibilities of this day, and keep us mindful of Thine eternal purposes. Coming to Thee in days of deep satisfaction for many good laws carefully fashioned for the common good, remind us from whence our help comes, and keep us humble in the face of accomplishment. Grant us such confidence in Thy sustaining power as will deliver us from obligation to any man, and lift us to an ever-higher level of dedication to the public good. Remold us into human forms that shall be acceptable in Thy sight, that all our days, begun, continued and ending in Thee, may be days that acknowledge our Creator. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 30, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of Thursday, September 30, 1965,

The Secretary of the Senate received the following message from the House of Representatives:

The Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of Thursday, September 30, 1965,

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on today, October 1, 1965, he signed the enrolled bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

No. 182—10

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9042) to provide for the implementation of the Agreement Concerning Automotive Products Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MILLS, Mr. KING of California, Mr. Boggs, Mr. KEOGH, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. UTT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 10281) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 508) authorizing the President to designate the 8-day period beginning October 10, 1965, as "Canberra Week," in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 10281) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 508) authorizing the President to designate the 8-day period beginning October 10, 1965, as "Canberra Week," was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there ob-

jection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Beverly W. Perkins, of Nevada, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Nevada;

John G. Chernenko, of West Virginia, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of West Virginia;

Joseph V. Conley, of Rhode Island, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Rhode Island;

Victor L. Wogan, Jr., of Louisiana, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Louisiana;

Donald F. Miller, of Washington, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Washington;

John W. Mahan, of Montana, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board;

Frank Morey Coffin, of Maine, to be U.S. circuit judge for the first circuit;

Dan Monronoe Russell, Jr., of Mississippi, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Mississippi;

Thomas L. Robinson, of Tennessee, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Tennessee;

Donald M. Statton, of Iowa, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Iowa; and

Hosea M. Ray, of Mississippi, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Mississippi.

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Edward C. Sweeney, of Illinois, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

By Mr. SMATHERS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Emmett E. Shelby, of Florida, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Florida.

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert H. Cowen, of North Carolina, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of North Carolina;

William H. Murdock, of North Carolina, to be U.S. attorney for the middle district of North Carolina; and

William Medford, of North Carolina, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of North Carolina.

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

John W. Hechinger, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of 1,439 Army officers for promotion to the grade

24899

24900

of colonel and below, and 2,711 Air Force officers for promotion to the grade of captain.

Since these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations are as follows:

Sterling H. Abernathy, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Smith B. Chamberlain, for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States;

Gordon (Armör) Rohn, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Bruce A. Dalton, Jr., and sundry other distinguished military students, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States; and

Harry H. Abe, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Air Force.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service. Since these names have previously appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing them on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Verne B. Lewis, of Maryland, and sundry other persons, for appointment, reappointment, and promotion in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—MARINE CORPS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of nominations in the Marine Corps.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will be stated.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to state sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and agreed to en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following calendar measures were considered and acted upon as indicated, and excerpts from the reports thereon were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT

The bill (S. 2542) to amend the Small Business Act was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4(c) of the Small Business Act is amended by striking out "\$1,721,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,841,000,000".

EXCERPTS FROM COMMITTEE REPORT (No. 794)

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

S. 2542 would increase the authorization for appropriations to the SBA revolving fund by \$120 million, from \$1,721 to \$1,841 million. This increase would correspond with the change made earlier this year by Public Law 89-78, which increased by \$120 million the limitation on loans from the SBA revolving fund to small business investment companies and State and local development companies.

GENERAL STATEMENT

H.R. 7847 was passed by the House on June 10, 1965. It increased the limitation on loans from the SBA revolving fund to small business investment companies and State and local development companies by \$120 million, from \$341 to \$461 million. H.R. 7847, as passed by the House, did not, however, increase the overall total of the revolving fund. During the hearings on H.R. 7847 on June 18, 1965, the Small Business Administrator testified as follows:

"I strongly recommend, therefore, that as you increase our investment division's outstanding loan authority by \$120 million, as provided by H.R. 7847, you amend the bill by striking out \$1,668 million in section 4(c) of the Small Business Act and inserting instead, \$1,786 million, an increase of \$120 million in our total authorization for the agency."

This change was not, however, made in H.R. 7847, which was reported to the Senate June 30, 1965, because of the need for prompt action. Subsequently, under section 316 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, Public Law 89-117, a lease guarantee program was created and \$5 million from the SBA revolving fund was provided as capital for these lease guarantees. At that time, the total authorization for appropriations was increased from \$1,716 to \$1,721 million to provide for the \$5 million lease guarantee fund. Accordingly, the total of the limitations on the separate programs in the revolving fund amounts to \$1,841 million, \$120 million more than the total authorization for appropriations to the SBA revolving fund.

Recent demands on the revolving fund have increased to such an extent that an increase in the authorization is essential.

WOMEN CLERKS IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The bill (H.R. 6165) to repeal section 165 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the appointment of women to clerkships in the executive departments, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXCERPT FROM COMMITTEE REPORT (No. 795)

PURPOSE

The purpose of this legislation is to repeal an obsolete statute relating to the appointment of women to clerkships in the executive departments, thereby strengthening Federal policy against discrimination in employment on the basis of sex.

JUSTIFICATION

Section 165 authorizes department heads, in their discretion, to appoint women to clerkships "upon the same requisites and conditions, and with the same compensations, as are prescribed for men."

This section is derived from an 1870 law which was advanced for its time since it assured women equal pay for equal work. Section 165 was later interpreted, however, as vesting in agency heads, to the exclusion of the President, the authority to limit the filling of a position to a certain sex. In other words, agency heads had free discretion to specify sex in their requests to the Civil Service Commission for certification, and the President could not authorize the Civil Service Commission to overrule them. This interpretation was overruled in a 1962 opinion of the Attorney General, thus opening the way for Presidential action to assure that appointment and promotion in the Federal service are made without regard to sex. The Civil Service Commission believes that under present circumstances, section 165 is an anachronism and strongly endorses its repeal.

HEARINGS

Public hearings were held on H.R. 6165 and S. 1769, an identical bill, before the Civil Service Subcommittee on September 21, 1965. All testimony favored enactment.

JOINT CONTRACTS FOR SUPPLIES AND SERVICES—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 1316) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into joint contracts for supplies and services on behalf of the District of Columbia and for other political divisions and subdivisions in the National Capital region was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and empowered to include in contracts for the procurement of supplies and services for the government of the District of Columbia the requirements for like supplies and services of any political division or subdivision in the National Capital region, possessing legal authority to have its supplies and services procured in such manner, upon a request therefor from an official who is authorized to and does thereby obligate such political division or subdivision to perform all liabilities or obligations which may result from the granting of such request or from action taken pursuant thereto, and

September 30, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

24741

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 297)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Third International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, which was held at Geneva, Switzerland, from August 31 to September 9, 1964, yielded much evidence that the world is on the threshold of an exciting new era of nuclear power. The work of the International Atomic Energy Agency at Vienna, since its establishment in 1957, has contributed to the development of the capabilities of many countries to cross this threshold. The programs of the International Atomic Energy Agency, as they were carried forward during 1964, gave promise that the Agency will contribute in growing measure over future years to the application of the atom to the constructive works of man.

Particularly noteworthy was the progress made by the International Atomic Energy Agency during 1964 in laying the foundations for restricting the use of nuclear energy exclusively to peaceful purposes. In February 1964 the Agency adopted a system of safeguards, applicable to all nuclear reactors, designed to guard against the diversion of nuclear materials to military use. In September 1964 the Agency's Director General reported that agreements had been negotiated with 17 of the 38 countries of the world possessing nuclear reactors, whereby some or all of their nuclear facilities would be placed under the safeguards of the Agency.

The United States has supported these activities, and looks to the Agency to play an increasingly significant role in developing the use of atomic energy for the benefit of the peoples of the world. U.S. participation in the International Atomic Energy Agency during the year 1964 is the subject of this eighth annual report which I am transmitting to the Congress pursuant to the provisions of the International Atomic Energy Agency Participation Act.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, September 30, 1965.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, PUBLIC HEALTH SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Public Health Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House September 29, 1965.)

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] 30 minutes and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, immigration is the most forceful factor in the development of the United States. We need immigration in order to magnify the uses of our great resources, physical, moral, and spiritual. Our greatness as a nation, a nation that soon will have a gross national product of \$700 billion, with the highest standard of living, was made possible in good part because of immigration.

We started with about 5 million people. Now we are over 194 million. That demographic growth was not all from within. It was also from accretion abroad. Since 1820, 43 million immigrants have come to the United States from all over the world. We drew up a great reservoir of alien brain and brawn. We shall continue to do so.

My grandparents came here from Germany in the 1840's. Driven by poverty and persecution they came, with thousands of others, to build our railroads, canals, bridges, roads and buildings, and later subways and skyscrapers. They made parched land blossom. Out of slums emerged anxious men and women to create our industries and the unions and to promote the arts and sciences.

Consider some of the illustrious names of our glittering roster of Members: ADAMO, ROONEY, FARBER, DULSKI, MATSUNAGA, DE LA GARZA, RODINO, KLUCZYNSKI, BRADEMANS, O'HARA, ST. ONGE, KASTENMEIER. They run the gamut of all nationalities and climes.

Their progenitors struggled and strived so that those who followed them could go to the university, enter professions and industry, and even to Congress.

These early ones did not know Poca-hontas or Myles Standish. They were not in the Social Register nor the Ivy League. Some came here in steerage, and as they sailed up New York Harbor and peeped out of portholes, they hailed, with joy in their hearts, the Statue of Liberty, where President Johnson, I hope, will sign this bill.

They are the alien warp and woof of America triumphant. The exodus out

of Europe was polyglot and heterogeneous. The people of all nations and all races helped build our great Nation. That is why we have struck down the national origins system of immigration which dealt unfairly with certain peoples. It was a most ungracious way of treating certain races which had been good to us.

We shall have scrapped this obsolete false notion of national origins entirely by July 1968 when all nations outside the Western Hemisphere shall be allotted a total of 170,000 immigrant visas—with no one country receiving more than 20,000 visas—while nations within the Western Hemisphere shall be allotted 120,000 immigrant visas annually, all on a first-come, first-served basis.

For the 3 years that the national origins theory shall remain in effect all unused quotas will no longer go to waste, but will be transferred to countries that have low quotas under the old law, like Italy, Greece, Spain, Romania, Holland, and so on. In addition, an estimated 60,000 parents, children or spouses of U.S. citizens will be admitted annually regardless of nationality or quota. The numbers that will come will not be much above those presently coming, but the distribution among nations will be equitable and fair.

The bill passed the House, but there were some changes in the Senate. The committee on conference has reconciled the differences. We did not emerge from the conference with all we desire, nor did the Senate. It was a conference—the usual give and take. If you want the rainbow, you must take the rain. If you want the rose, you must put up with the thorns.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I want to thank my fellow conferees for their indefatigable application to this painstaking job. We worked in a thoroughly cooperative spirit. I wish to thank Messrs. FEIGHAN, CHELF, RODINO, DONOHUE, BROOKS, McCULLOCH, MOORE, and CAHILL.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report provides as follows:

With reference to refugees, the number permissible is 10,200. We widened the definition of refugee to include victims of natural calamities, which was not in the House bill. Thus, victims of earthquakes, floods and tornadoes will be included but the number of refugees is not increased.

We set up a Select Commission of 15 Members on Western Hemisphere Immigration, to be composed of 5 Members from the House, 5 Members from the Senate, and 5 members to be appointed by the President. No more than three of the members appointed by the Speaker or the President of the Senate shall be members of one party.

Immigration officers as well as consular officers may administer oaths outside the United States. This conforms to existing laws.

The Senate bill had a provision that the Attorney General could suspend the deportation of alien crewmen and adjust their status to lawful permanent residents. The House bill had no such provision. The conferees agreed to the Senate version with an amendment preclud-

ing suspension of deportation of those seamen who entered subsequent to June 30, 1964. But before the status of those individuals can be thus adjusted, they would have to show hardship and establish that for 7 years they had been leading law-abiding and moral lives.

The Senate version had a provision to adjust the status of natives of the Western Hemisphere, now in the United States, who fled from their native country because of Communist persecution or the fear of persecution. This refers to the Cuban refugees of which there are about 200,000 in the United States. The conferees deleted the Senate provision but added that the Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration shall address itself to this matter and report to the Congress.

The House version provided a discretionary waiver of exclusion based upon the mental retardation of children 14 years of age or younger, when accompanied by a U.S. citizen or a permanent resident alien parent. We extended the waiver to include all persons regardless of age.

The Senate provision permitted legalization of the status of those aliens improperly in the United States who entered prior to June 28, 1958. The conferees agreed to adjust the date to June 30, 1948.

The present law provides for adjustment of status if the entry was before 1940. The conferees extended the period 8 years.

The House version had no ceiling on admissions from the Western Hemisphere. The Senate provided a limitation of 120,000 immigration visas annually to all countries of the Western Hemisphere. It was felt that since countries outside the Western Hemisphere had limitations or a ceiling, the same might well apply to countries of the Western Hemisphere.

With only two exceptions, all conferees signed the conference report.

There was the strongest bipartisan support for this conference report.

I believe the bill is a fair bill. As I said a moment ago, it does not contain everything that we had hoped to get, but it is the best we could get under the circumstances.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, who is a member of the committee.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the splendid explanation that the chairman has given. There were two subjects to which he did not address himself, about which I understood there had been some discussion. I do not want to take a lot of time, but I wonder if the chairman would comment on the provision which I understood had been considered to give the Secretary of Agriculture, rather than the Secretary of Labor, authority in the field of the admission of seasonal migrant workers.

Mr. CELLER. That was not in either bill and thus not in issue in the conference.

Mr. WHITENER. Very well. I understood there was some effort to change

the deportation rules to provide that if an alien had been in this country for 10 years or longer, he could not be subject to deportation because of some entry that was made which was in violation of the present law.

Mr. CELLER. There was no discussion of any statute of limitations, because such a provision was not in either bill. The law as it exists today remains in that regard.

Mr. WHITENER. Notwithstanding the time an alien has been in this country, he would still be subject to deportation if it appeared that back in his youth he had been charged with some offense?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary yielding. I, too, in general would compliment the conferees under the chairman on bringing back this report, an excellent report, to the floor of the House.

Quite naturally my question pertains to numbered paragraph 6, or section 15 of the House bill, involving the discretionary waiver of mental retardedness. Would the chairman explain if that provision involves also mental deficiency in the range of mental disorders?

Mr. CELLER. So far as I understand the situation, it is limited to what is known to the medical profession as mental retardation. There is provision for waiver of a prior attack of insanity if the Public Health Service certifies that the alien has recovered.

Mr. HALL. This is a very important point. I appreciate the gentleman's response.

Will the Senate version, which was accepted by the conferees, still require certification by the proper physician of the overseas Public Health Service?

Mr. CELLER. Yes. There is no change in that regard.

Mr. HALL. Would the distinguished gentleman estimate that the bill will cut down on the number of private bills for the immigration of the mentally ill and/or mental retardedness?

Mr. CELLER. I think it should cut down the number.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. Frankly, I do not think we have very many of that kind of case. I am informed that there are about 40 private bills a year of that type introduced.

Mr. HALL. On some days when they are before us on the Private Calendar, they seem overly large in number.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman may be correct. I am speaking from memory. Perhaps my memory is faulty.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank my distinguished chairman. I have a question with respect to an item that the House, as I recall, voted down and the Senate

incorporated by way of an amendment. That provision has to do with quota determinations for the Western Hemisphere. I wonder if the gentleman could describe exactly the tenor of the changes in this act with respect to Western Hemisphere immigration.

Mr. CELLER. There is no quota placed on any country of the Western Hemisphere. We simply placed a total ceiling on all countries in the Western Hemisphere at 120,000 immigration visas a year. That is exclusive of what we call visas granted to immediate relatives, that is, children, spouses, and parents of American citizens.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Is this not contradictory to the whole body of tradition, especially in view of the overall philosophy we have employed in selling this bill? Now it seems as if we are erecting a wall, rather than reducing walls, which we originally intended to do.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman may remember that I was very strongly in favor of no ceiling on the Western Hemisphere when the bill was discussed in the House originally. I had taken my cue from the administration in that regard.

The gentleman on the other side [Mr. MacGregor] offered an amendment to impose a ceiling, and on a teller vote we lost. The ceiling would have been imposed. On a record vote, the result was very close. I believe the teller vote was disturbed, if I remember correctly, by only some 8 votes. So I would say the House is fairly divided on the subject of whether there should or should not be a ceiling on immigration from the Western Hemisphere.

As the gentleman knows, when we get into a conference one cannot dictate exactly what the result will be. It is necessary to consult with all of the conferees and not only with the House conferees. In this situation we found that the position of the Republican House conferees was consistent with the views of Mr. MacGregor and also with the Senate conferees, and thus the situation was placed in a little different light.

So, as I said before, after working it out, hemming and hawing and arguing back and forth, we finally came to the conclusion, in order to get something done, that we should do this. Otherwise, we would have found ourselves in a situation which would be the rock on which the conference would split. Rather than have no bill, I had to reluctantly, personally, yield.

I deeply sympathize with the gentleman's point of view. I agree with his point of view. But I could not have my views prevail. I knew when I was licked.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I understand, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly wish to compliment the chairman on the fact that he has unequivocally stated his position on this issue. That is the reason why I wanted to know more of the details of what transpired.

Mr. CELLER. May I add one more point?

Mr. GONZALEZ. Certainly.

Mr. CELLER. We did set up the Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration, to be composed of 15 mem-

September 30, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

24743

bers. This matter of Western Hemisphere immigration impinges upon foreign policy, and the Executive naturally should have some direction in this matter. Congress should have some direction. We await with interest what this Commission will report. They are to study all phases of this question, and they will report to the Congress.

At some subsequent time, if it is essential to make changes, we can make changes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I have one more question. I do not know that I personally can accept the compromise which, by the very nature of his position, the distinguished chairman saw fit to accept.

Mr. CELLER. I want to tell the gentleman that we have a limited time, and I should like to be sure that the other side gets time.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Briefly, I have a question with regard to page 8 of the report. Section 9 relates to section 211 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and section 211(a) in the paragraph containing the amendment includes "under the regulations issued by the Attorney General."

I was wondering if the chairman could explain this amendment, on page 8 of the report.

Mr. CELLER. We are on the conference report?

Mr. GONZALEZ. On the conference report.

Mr. CELLER. Page 8 of the conference report?

Mr. GONZALEZ. Page 8 of the conference report.

Mr. CELLER. What paragraph are you referring to?

Mr. GONZALEZ. The very first one, section 211(a). It reads:

SEC. 211. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) no immigrant shall be admitted into the United States unless at the time of application for admission he (1) has a valid unexpired immigrant visa or was born subsequent to the issuance of such visa of the accompanying parent, and (2) presents a valid unexpired passport or other suitable travel document, or document of identity and nationality, if such document is required under the regulations issued by the Attorney General. With respect to immigrants to be admitted under quotas of quota areas prior to June 30, 1968, no immigrant visa shall be deemed valid unless the immigrant is properly chargeable to the quota area under the quota of which the visa is issued.

Mr. CELLER. I say it is existing law, and we make no change in it. No change whatsoever.

Mr. GONZALEZ. That is what I wanted to get. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT], a member of the committee.

Mr. GILBERT. First, Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment my distinguished chairman for the work he has done on this bill. As a member of the Subcommittee on Immigration of the committee, I wish to point out to the chairman that I am personally gravely disappointed that the conferees of the House capitulated so quickly to the Senate version with respect to placing the limitation of

120,000 on the Western Hemisphere. I think it was only last week that the House adopted a resolution which poked a finger right in the eye of all of Latin America. I think now, by the inclusion of the adoption of a limitation or quota on the Western Hemisphere, we are taking the finger and poking it into the other eye of Latin America. I am sorely disappointed at the actions of the conferees with respect to this particular point. I hope it does not adversely affect our relations with all of Latin and South America.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

(Mr. MOORE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I very much want to take this opportunity to say to the House that the conference report we are considering at this time is basically the House position in every respect with one major exception, that is, we have included the ceiling on Western Hemisphere immigration at 120,000, which was discussed in the committee in the House at the time it was submitted by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR].

I think it is fair to say to the Members of the House that in each of the areas in which there were matters in difference between that which we passed in this body and the action which was performed by the other body, that in almost every respect the position of the House was maintained. I think if you will recall the original debate on the changes which were suggested in our immigration policy at the time of consideration of the legislation in the House, that there was some real concern as to whether the House or, I should say, the two bodies of the Congress, would continue to exercise control over the Nation's immigration policy.

I think that this conference report has confirmed once and for all that the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States shall continue to exert their constitutional control over the immigration policy of our country. This is particularly significant in the make-up of the Commission on the Western Hemisphere which is created by this bill as passed by the other body. Initially they suggested it be a 15-man Commission, 9 members to be appointed by the President of the United States and 3 to be appointed by the Speaker of the House and 3 by the President of the Senate.

An amendment was agreed to by the conferees which would provide for the Commission to be made up of 15 members, but that the President would appoint 5 and each of the two bodies of the legislative branch of the Government would appoint 5, giving, I believe, without question, full control over the Commission to those of us in the legislative branch of the Government who are given the responsibility constitutionally in this area.

I think what should be said here today with respect to the changes that we

have made and contemplate by the passage and acceptance of this conference report is simply this. When anyone in your constituency asks you about our immigration policies, about the number of immigrants that are coming into this country, I think for the first time you can honestly say what the number will be coming into this Nation, or what the maximum ceiling is on annual immigration.

Heretofore our immigration flow into this country was from any one of a number of eight different areas and it was, I would say, extremely difficult to anticipate what would happen under the authority written into the law as to the number of people that could actually come into our country in any given area.

And let me use the Western Hemisphere for example. While the annual average over the past 10 years has been 110,000, with severe increases in the last 5 years it should be restated that there was no ceiling. In any one year it could easily go up to a quarter of a million or as many as half a million. In our refugee programs, under the fair share law, it was reasonable to anticipate that our immigration of refugees would not materially escalate, but we had no reason to state with any assurance that X number of refugees was all that could come into the United States in any given year. But under this legislation, every Member of this Congress knows that the refugee flow into the United States is limited to the number of 10,200.

So it is fair to say that what we have before us is a suggestion, for our consideration, to make our immigration flow come from three specific areas; 170,000 external to the Western Hemisphere, 10,200 of that number being set aside for refugees; 120,000 ceiling on the immigration flow from the Western Hemisphere and in addition to that X number—we cannot be absolutely certain in this area as to the numbers that will come in—nonquota who are parents and spouses and children of intending immigrants.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment wholeheartedly the House conferees who brought back to the House this immigration legislation. This is far better legislation than the bill that passed the House several weeks ago. The conferees have done a fine job in finally working out adequate, comprehensive immigration legislation to replace inadequate, inequitable, antiquated legislation that badly needed change.

Particularly I want to pay tribute to the gentleman in the well of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE], who I believe is one of the most knowledgeable, if not the most knowledgeable, Members in the Congress on immigration matters. I know of his long and diligent investigation of and work on immigration problems. I think all of us on both sides of the aisle owe him a debt of gratitude for his superb work.

24744

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

September 30, 1965

Although I have complimented all of the conferees, Republicans and Democrats alike, I think it is appropriate, Mr. Speaker, for me to say strong and emphatic words congratulating the other members of the conference committee on our side of the aisle: the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH], the ranking Republican member on the Committee on the Judiciary, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL], a distinguished lawyer and expert on immigration legislation. But may I add words of congratulation to a person on the subcommittee that handled immigration who, unfortunately, for understandable reasons, was not a member of the conference committee. I speak now of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] who was the author of the important amendment placing a ceiling on immigration from the Western Hemisphere. This amendment, strongly opposed by the Johnson administration, barely defeated in the House, has now been incorporated in the final version of the legislation. We all owe a debt of gratitude to the able, constructive legislator, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR]. I believe his fight when the bill was before the House to impose a reasonable ceiling on Americans from the Western Hemisphere was significant in making the other body come to the realization that this was a sound proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by urging that all Members of the House vote for this conference report. It is good legislation. It is sound legislation. It is a great improvement over that legislation which we have had on the statute books, as amended, for a great many years.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF].

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to associate myself with the remarks, the commendation and the tribute of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORP] in his salute and his justifiable recognition of this outstanding West Virginian, and great American, Representative ARCH MOORE.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to have been a member of this subcommittee for now almost 19 years. I have seen some good men come and some good men go during that time. But, believe me, sir, I have never seen a more dedicated, sincere, honest intelligent, capable, hard working member than the gentleman now occupying the well of the House, Mr. MOORE.

He, together with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], chairman of our subcommittee, has done a magnificent job. Without this great team working and pulling together—we would not have an immigration bill. This was a non-partisan job. I would be derelict in my duty and to my colleagues and to the Nation if I did not say today that it has been a joy and a privilege and a pleasure yes, a real satisfaction to have been able to be associated on this fine committee

and to work with you, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. FEIGHAN, on this committee over these past years.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we, your managers on the part of this House, have come back to the House of Representatives today in a blaze of glory. The MacGregor amendment that was adopted here in the House by a teller vote of 196 to 194 has been restored, and what is more important—retained in the bill. It was because this most important amendment was later deleted that I voted against the bill. I had to leave my President, my Speaker, and both of my chairmen when I spoke up for this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, we now have a good bill, and I urge, and I beg, and I implore, and I plead with my colleagues to support it.

It is the best bill with which we could possibly come to the floor, and it is one that you can go home and defend. Mr. Speaker, all of the members of our subcommittee have done the Nation a great service by voting for and supporting this bill. Thank heaven that we have men of their vision, devotion to duty and their character at the helm of our Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee of this House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. I would like to ask a question relating to section 15 of the conference report which deals with mentally retarded children.

I have had two specific cases in the congressional district which it is my honor to represent, where the rest of the family were admitted to the United States but a single retarded child at that time was barred—if my understanding is correct section 15 in this bill would now make it possible when a family is to be admitted to the United States for that mentally retarded child to come in with the rest of the members of the family; is that correct?

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman's interpretation of the legislation is correct. That child could enter with his parents.

Mr. BALDWIN. And, if the gentleman will yield further, that would be regardless of the age of the child?

Mr. MOORE. That is right. As the gentleman will recall, we in the House placed 14-year-olds as an age limitation on the entry, but the Senate removed the age limitation. Now it would apply without respect to age with reference to persons in the mental retardation area.

Mr. BALDWIN. And, if the gentleman will yield further, it would also apply even if the child is the only member of the family remaining in the foreign country—because of having been previously barred by the old Act—and he could now be brought in, even though the rest of his family is now here?

Mr. MOORE. That is correct. That child presently is excluded under our

law by reason of his mental condition. What we have done here is this: That child will now be permitted to join his family that may be in residence here in the United States.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia and wish to congratulate the conferees for making this change in the law.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, may I say to the Members of the House that some question was raised and discussion was had with respect to the problem of Cuban refugees. The Senate inserted a suggested status change for them or an opportunity to have status in such a way that your House conferees felt that this was neither the time nor the opportunity to discuss the same; that it is a matter which should be discussed by the Commission which has been created under this legislation and is directed to do so and that we should not give any consideration at this time to any of the problems of the situation with reference to the Cuban refugees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, there are two points I want to make so that I feel the membership of the House may be fully informed as to what we are doing in this immigration field.

I want to reemphasize what we do here today in great measure strengthens our immigration laws as they are presently on the books.

We have for the first time very strict labor controls in this legislation, and I believe it will in great measure meet with the full and complete agreement of every Member of the House. What we did in this area was in the best interest of the country, and in the best interest of those who labor in this country for a living. In addition to that, I think everybody who goes home from this session of Congress is going to be criticized and be met with the suggestion that great numbers have again been added to those who can come into this country. I have looked very deeply into the statistical data available to us from the Department of State where they tried to anticipate what might happen after this law becomes operative on June 30, 1968. It is my best opinion, based upon their best estimate, there would not be any material change in the numbers that come into this country, and, as a matter of fact, it could conceivably happen there will be less immigration flowing from all areas of the world into this country after June 30, 1968, than we are presently experiencing.

Several gentlemen in the House who have served on the committee have been more than kind in their reference to my work in this area. I would be totally remiss, Mr. Speaker, today if I did not say to each Member of the Congress that the conferees did what I believe to be an outstanding job, and in the best interests of the country.

September 30, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

24745

The gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] has always been at the forefront in this battle. I may say, however, that this House should understand that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Feighan] has done a tremendous job in marshaling the committee together into many, many executive sessions to consider this matter and, if I may say so, he has done this for the sole purpose of bringing about remedial legislation in the field of immigration. I believe the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Feighan] has done a tremendous job in this area, and I believe it merits the sincere support of all Members of the House of Representatives.

[Mr. Feighan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. McCulloch. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Cahill].

Mr. Cahill. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I, too, today share the observations and the pride of the chairman of the full committee concerning the contributions that have been made by all immigrants to the greatness of our country, and certainly share the views concerning the importance and acceptability of this conference report as outlined by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore].

As has been frequently suggested, during this session, the minority party is rarely given the credit it deserves. But I would say without any hesitation that the immigration bill, and the conference report on that subject, is in a large measure due to the great contribution that was made by the minority party, and particularly the leadership of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] and the logic which was expressed and argued persuasively by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor].

I point out that the sole purpose—or certainly the principal purpose of the bill—was to eliminate discrimination as it had long existed by reason of the national origins quota system. I remember the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor], pointing out on the floor of the House that if we were going to eliminate discrimination, we ought to do it completely. It seems to me that it was his logic and his persuasiveness that compelled the Senate and all of the conferees, on both sides of the aisle, to accept in this conference report a ceiling of 120,000 from the Western Hemisphere.

But I would also add, especially to my friend from New York, who had some questions concerning the validity of this provision, that again, due to the wisdom of the conferees, I believe, if there is any doubt or any problem or any interference with the national policy of our country, it is safeguarded in this conference report by the presence of the committee controlled by the Congress of the United States, but having five public members appointed by the President. So that if there is any mistake discovered during the next 3 years, it can be brought to the attention of the Congress, and if there is any omission or correction that is needed, we can make it.

So I believe the conference report is one that can be voted on favorably by every Member of this House on both sides of the aisle. I enthusiastically support it and urge its adoption. It represents a necessary and important change in the new law regulating immigration.

Mr. McCulloch. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Poff] 2 minutes.

Mr. Poff. Mr. Speaker, I address the House as a former member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality. I speak as one who has acquired perhaps a hard-nosed reputation on the subject of immigration. But I speak as one who has followed the course of the immigration bill in most careful detail from its inception several years ago when the late distinguished Member from Pennsylvania, the Honorable Tad Walter, began the first hearings which gave genesis to this legislation.

I can say without equivocation that the conference report as presently constructed represents an improvement over both the House bill and the bill passed by the other body. As such, I will vote for the conference report. I shall do so enthusiastically. It will strengthen the present law in several material particulars.

I would not want the opportunity to pass without echoing the tributes which have been paid to those on the subcommittee responsible for this legislation.

I have particular reference to the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Feighan]; to the ranking minority members of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore]; and to the able gentleman from Minnesota, who made such a major contribution to the final form of this bill [Mr. MacGregor].

During the course of the debate in the House I was one of those who attempted to persuade the House to adopt the MacGregor amendment. The House by a narrow vote rejected the MacGregor amendment, and I am glad to see that the other body has corrected this error and taken a step which I believe should be taken at this time, a step which I predict will not have the adverse effects which have been claimed for it but rather will have beneficial consequences in both domestic affairs and foreign affairs.

Mr. McCulloch. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor].

Mr. MacGregor. Mr. Speaker, this conference report should be supported by every Member of the House of Representatives. The final bill as worked out by the House and Senate conferees makes historic progress in emphasizing America's desire to reunite families. Its provisions strengthen national security and protect each American worker.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will completely sweep away discrimination on account of race, national origin, and geographic location of birth in our immigration laws.

Let me address myself to the concern expressed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez], and the gentleman from

New York [Mr. Gilbert]. Mr. Gonzalez expressed his reservation about a ceiling of 120,000 annually on Western Hemisphere immigration, a ceiling which will exclude immediate family members. Mr. Gilbert expressed his concern about the reaction of our friends south of the Rio Grande and in the Caribbean to this new development in our immigration policy.

Let me point out to these gentlemen and to all Members of the House that this conference report treats immigrants from the Western Hemisphere more favorably than immigrants from anywhere else in the world in three respects: First, by giving 120,000 numbers to the Western Hemisphere favoritism is shown in relationship to the 170,000 numbers given to the rest of the world; second, no country of the Western Hemisphere will be subject to the 20,000 per country limit that will apply to our historic friends and allies across the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans; and, third, the requirements of the preference system will not apply to the countries of the Western Hemisphere.

In view of these facts it is important to point out that the acceptance of the worldwide ceiling concept, with the inclusion of immigrants from all countries under a numerical limitation, is not a new idea nor is it original with me. Ten years ago, in February of 1955, a group of Congressmen and Senators, whom I am sure most of us would agree were outstanding men despite disagreement with their political philosophies, offered a comprehensive immigration bill. Members will find in the Record of February 25, 1955, an address by the then Senator from New York, Mr. Lehman, describing that bill. It was cosponsored by Senator Lehman and by the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House [Mr. Celler].

That bill would have established a worldwide ceiling of 250,000 annually. It would have extended the ceiling to all immigration from the Western Hemisphere, from whence immigrants would have been treated on exactly the same basis as immigrants from across the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

Senator Lehman included this analysis of the 1955 Celler-Lehman bill:

A major feature of the proposed act is its consolidation, within the quota, of all general immigration, including immigration from the Western Hemisphere. This has been done in order to put all foreign countries on the same basis consistent with the best interests and needs of the United States. Thus the proposed act does not give non-quota status, as present law does, to aliens born in the Western Hemisphere, with the right to immigrate to the United States without limitation as to number.

In addition—and this is a vital feature—a nonquota status is given to parents as well as to children and spouses of American citizens (sec. 102(a) (19)(A)).

At the same time that nonquota status is given to parents of American citizens, the proposed act deprives aliens born in the Western Hemisphere of their nonquota status, as already described.

The effect of these changes is to confine the nonquota status to very special classes of immigrants—children, spouses, and parents of citizens, professors, ministers, and one or two other technical categories—and to place

all general immigration, including immigration from the Western Hemisphere, under the quota system.

The bill we are considering today treats prospective immigrants from the Western Hemisphere more favorably than they would have been treated under the bill cosponsored by Senator Lehman and Congressman Celler.

May I add for the RECORD the names of these additional cosponsors of this legislation in 1955: The now Vice President of the United States, HUBERT HUMPHREY; the deceased Senator Kefauver of Tennessee; the deceased former President of the United States, John F. Kennedy; Senators Chavez, MAGNUSON, McNAMARA, PASTORE, and as cosponsors in the House with our distinguished Judiciary Committee chairman, Mr. Celler, was the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. RODINO, the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. YATES, Mr. POWELL, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. MACDONALD, Mr. ASHLEY, and Mr. REUSS, among others.

This comprehensive bill introduced by these gentlemen 10 years ago would have been more restrictive on Western Hemisphere immigration than the bill we are about to adopt by what I hope will be a virtually unanimous vote in this Chamber today.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacGREGOR. I yield to gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Is it the gentleman's contention that adopting a ceiling for the Western Hemisphere nations is not an unprecedented action?

Mr. MacGREGOR. To my knowledge, establishing this very generous ceiling which gives favored treatment to the Western Hemisphere is a new step in immigration laws and a step first proposed, according to my research, by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] and by Senator Lehman 10½ years ago.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Then it is a new and novel inclusion in our immigration legislation?

Mr. MacGREGOR. No, not at all. The idea has been pending in various legislative proposals for many years.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Not the idea. I am asking specifically if the gentleman holds to the thought that this is not an unprecedented action with reference to the Western Hemisphere nations with respect to our immigration laws.

Mr. MacGREGOR. May I say it is a very wise and thoughtful step which we are taking perhaps 10½ years too late.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MacGREGOR. May I say to the gentleman from Texas and to all others in the House that if the ideas of the gentlemen whose names I have listed had any validity 10 years ago, then this conference report today should be adopted by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacGREGOR. I yield to the distinguished member of the Subcommittee on Immigration, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF].

Mr. CHELF. The gentleman is so eminently correct when he says that our neighbors to the south of the border, our Latin American friends—all in the Western Hemisphere have been really treated decently. This is so because while there is a ceiling of 170,000 for the entire world we have set an additional ceiling of 120,000 especially for our neighbors and friends in this hemisphere. This is concrete, ample proof to them that we are giving them approximately 40 percent of the total ceiling allowed throughout the length and breadth of the world.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for emphasizing once again that we are giving favored treatment to our friends south of the Rio Grande in adopting this conference report today.

Mr. CHELF. If a 40-percent ratio is bad treatment, I want you to give me that kind for the rest of my natural life. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me salute the gentleman, Mr. MacGREGOR for offering his amendment. It is a wise and a just one. Now please let me thank publicly my two chairmen—Mr. Celler and Mr. FEIGHAN. Along with the entire subcommittee they are especially deserving of credit. Why that good chairman of ours, Mr. FEIGHAN, almost worked the hides off of us on the subcommittee. He kept calling meetings day after day—week after week until we had gotten the job done. He is justly entitled to all of the praise that one can heap upon him. His leadership was inspiring to all of us—his tenacity to purpose helped to beat the adjournment deadline.

(Mr. MacGREGOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say to the House that the conference committee was in session for more than 4 hours on the differences between the House and the other body. In all my experience in the Congress I enjoyed nothing more than the harmonious, constructive working session of the committee.

I join in what has been said about all of my colleagues who were members of the committee, and I want to refer, again, to that able, gentlemanly, kindly chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and to my good friend ARCH MOORE, top Republican member of the subcommittee, who carried the burden so effectively for so long. That so many members of the House voted for the legislation when it was first before the House, and who will soon vote to accept the report, is a fine tribute to ARCH MOORE; to MIKE FEIGHAN, whom I have known so long and so favorably. You know, Mr. Speaker, MIKE FEIGHAN was the minority leader of the Ohio House of Representatives more years ago than either of us like to admit, when I was speaker of the Ohio house. It has been a happy occasion for me to work with him on many important matters, including the matter before us today. I com-

mend the conference committee report to every Member of the House. I am of the firm opinion that it would serve a useful public purpose if it were overwhelmingly accepted by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY].

(Mr. McCLORY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add my support to the adoption of the conference report on the 1965 amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act, H.R. 2580.

In this behalf, I take occasion to compliment the members of the conference committee and particularly my colleagues from this body. In my opinion, the House conferees have resolved the differences between the House and Senate versions of this legislation in a manner consistent with the views of the vast majority of the Members of this body and that great majority of Americans throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to pay particular tribute to the contributions made by the Republican members of the House Judiciary Committee in carrying forward views consistent with our Republican platform and principles. My colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore], has performed a stellar job in this connection. In addition, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGREGOR], by persisting in behalf of a numerical ceiling on Western Hemisphere immigration, has helped produce a result which is equitable for the people of all of the friendly nations throughout the world. I am thinking primarily of our friends across the Atlantic with whom we have so much in common and whose citizens by emigrating to these shores in the past have contributed so substantially to our culture, our economy, and our political system.

Mr. Speaker, the conference committee report results in producing an immigration bill which should contribute to our country's improved foreign relations and to an orderly immigration system consistent with the natural growth and development of our society.

I am particularly happy that this legislation will enable the families of American citizens to be reunited more rapidly and that we will have the benefit of those skilled and professional individuals who prefer our system of government and who desire the opportunities which are afforded in our land.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of this body may take justifiable pride in this achievement of the 89th Congress and I am personally proud to have made a small contribution to the final result.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, the Immigration Act now before the Congress represents a welcome change in U.S. immigration policy by removing the obnoxious and discriminatory system of national quotas. I will vote for the bill.

This bill, however, does in my opinion include one serious error of judgment. By imposing a limitation on immigration from the Western Hemisphere it threatens to end the historic free flow of im-

migrants across the U.S. boundaries with Canada and Mexico.

When the bill was first before the House, I joined with my colleagues to defeat a proposed amendment to place a limit on immigration into the United States from the Western Hemisphere. I did so for two reasons: First, representatives of the administration had led many of us to believe that in their judgment imposition of such a limitation at this time would seriously impair U.S. relations with Latin America; and second, I was concerned that such a limitation might seriously reduce the free flow of emigration to this country from Canada and Mexico.

In the Senate an annual limitation of 120,000 immigrants from the Western Hemisphere was placed in the bill after assurances from the President that he did not oppose the provision. Those assurances help to satisfy my first area of concern over this provision.

Nonetheless I remain disturbed by the possibility that the annual limitation on Western Hemisphere emigration to the United States may affect our relations with our only contiguous neighbors, Canada and Mexico. During fiscal year 1964, 139,284 persons, including spouses and children, emigrated from Western Hemisphere countries to the United States. Over half of these came from our immediate neighbors—38,074 from Canada and 32,967 from Mexico.

If the rate of Western Hemisphere emigration to the United States remains at this level, or as is more likely increases, and if the bill is administered on a first-come-first-serve basis, there is no assurance whatsoever that Canada and Mexico emigration to the United States will not be affected.

I am sympathetic to the proposition that if regional immigration quotas are assigned to the rest of the world, they should also be assigned to the Western Hemisphere, for there is no inherent difference between these nations and others. There is, however, one vital distinction between Canada and Mexico and all the other nations of the world. They are the only two countries which border directly on the United States—and in my opinion fully free and unlimited immigration between the United States and its immediate neighbors should be maintained.

Nine of my colleagues joined me in a statement on United States-Canadian relations last Monday which proposed that United States-Canadian immigration remain unlimited, except for the reasonable qualifications of financial responsibility and good moral character.

Mr. Speaker, because this is a bill from conference, and the House does not have the option of amending it, and because in balance it is a progressive step in U.S. immigration policy, I shall vote for the bill. But I hope that the Select Commission on Immigration from the Western Hemisphere, which this bill establishes, will give every serious consideration to recommendations to leave Canadian and Mexican emigration to the United States unlimited. The Select Commission must report to the Congress with its recommendations fully 6 months before the limitation on Western Hemisphere immi-

gration is scheduled to become effective in June of 1968. I have every confidence that the President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives in making their appointments to the Select Commission will assure consideration of U.S. immigration policy toward Canada and Mexico, and that thereby we can rectify the shortcomings of this bill so as to preserve the closest and the most productive relations possible with our Canadian and Mexican neighbors.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. GONZALEZ
Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Clerk will report the motion. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GONZALEZ moves to recommit the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2580) to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to reject the Senate amendment placing a ceiling on immigration from the Western Hemisphere in the amount of 120,000 persons per annum.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I raise the question whether the gentleman's motion is in order. The gentleman from New York moved the previous question on the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After the previous question is ordered a motion to recommit is in order if the gentleman is opposed to the conference report, and no Member on the minority side seeks to offer such a motion. The gentleman is recognized on his motion.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 320, nays 69, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 341]

YEAS—320

Adair	Betts	Callaway
Adams	Bingham	Cameron
Addabbo	Blatnik	Carey
Albert	Boggs	Casey
Anderson,	Boland	Cederberg
Tenn.	Bolling	Celler
Andrews,	Bow	Chamberlain
N. Dak.	Brademas	Chelf
Annunzio	Bray	Clancy
Arends	Brook	Clark
Ashbrook	Brooks	Clausen,
Ashley	Broomfield	Don H.
Ayres	Brown, Calif.	Clawson, Del.
Baldwin	Broyhill, N.C.	Cleveland
Bandiera	Broyhill, Va.	Clevenger
Barrett	Burke	Cohelan
Bates	Burton, Calif.	Collier
Battin	Byrne, Pa.	Conable
Belcher	Byrnes, Wis.	Conte
Bell	Cabell	Conyers
Bennett	Cahill	Corbett
Berry	Callan	Corman

Craley	Jacobs	Poff
Cramer	Jarman	Pool
Culver	Jennings	Powell
Cunningham	Joelson	Price
Curtin	Johnson, Calif.	Pucinski
Curtis	Johnson, Pa.	Quile
Dague	Jones	Race
Daniels	Jones, Ala.	Redlin
Davis, Wis.	Karsten	Reid, Ill.
Delaney	Karth	Reid, N.Y.
Dent	Kastenmeier	Reifel
Denton	Kee	Reinecke
Derwinski	Keith	Resnick
Devine	Kelly	Reuss
Dickinson	Keogh	Rhodes, Ariz.
Dingell	King, Calif.	Rhodes, Pa.
Dole	King, N.Y.	Rodino
Donohue	King, Utah	Rogers, Colo.
Dulski	Kirwan	Rogers, Fla.
Dwyer	Kluczyński	Ronan
Dyal	Kornegay	Rooney, N.Y.
Edmondson	Krebs	Rooney, Pa.
Ellsworth	Kunkel	Rosenthal
Erlenborn	Laird	Rostenkowski
Evans, Colo.	Langen	Roudebush
Evins, Tenn.	Latta	Roush
Fallon	Leggett	Rumsfeld
Farbstein	Lippscomb	Ryan
Farnsley	Long, Md.	St. Onge
Farnum	Love	Saylor
Fascell	McCarthy	Scheuer
Feighan	McClary	Schisler
Findley	McCulloch	Schmidhauser
Fino	McDade	Schneebeli
Flood	McDowell	Schwelker
Foley	McEwen	Senner
Ford, Gerald R.	McFall	Shipley
Ford,	McGrath	Shriver
William D.	McVicker	Sickles
Fraser	Macdonald	Sikes
Friedel	MacGregor	Sisk
Fulton, Pa.	Machen	Skubitz
Fulton, Tenn.	Mackay	Slack
Gallagher	Mackie	Smith, Calif.
Garman	Madden	Smith, Iowa
Gialmo	Mailhard	Smith, N.Y.
Gibbons	Martin, Mass.	Springer
Gilbert	Martin, Nebr.	Stafford
Gilligan	Mathias	Staggers
Grahowski	Matsunaga	Stallbaum
Gray	May	Stanton
Green, Oreg.	Meeds	Steed
Green, Pa.	Miller	Stratton
Greigg	Minish	Sullivan
Grider	Mink	Sweeney
Griffin	Minshall	Talcott
Griffiths	Moeller	Taylor
Grover	Monagan	Teague, Calif.
Gubser	Moore	Tenzer
Gurney	Moorhead	Thomson, Wis.
Hagen, Calif.	Morgan	Todd
Hall	Morrison	Trimble
Halleck	Morse	Tunney
Halpern	Morton	Tupper
Hamilton	Mosher	Udall
Hanley	Moss	Ullman
Hanna	Multer	Van Deerlin
Hansen, Idaho	Murphy, Ill.	Vank
Hansen, Wash.	Murray	Vigorito
Harris	Nedzi	Vivian
Harsha	Neisen	Watkins
Harvey, Ind.	O'Brien	Watts
Harvey, Mich.	O'Hara, Mich.	Weltner
Hathaway	O'Konski	Whalley
Hawkins	Olsen, Mont.	White, Idaho
Hays	Olson, Minn.	Widnall
Hechler	O'Neill, Mass.	Wilson,
Helstoski	Ottlinger	Charles H.
Hicks	Patman	Wolff
Holland	Patten	Wright
Horton	Pelly	Wyatt
Howard	Pepper	Wydler
Hungate	Perkins	Yates
Huot	Philbin	Younger
Hutchinson	Pickle	Zablocki
Ichord	Pike	
Irwin	Pinnie	

NAYS—69

Abbutt	Edwards, Ala.	Landrum
Abernethy	Everett	Lennon
Andrews,	Fisher	McMillan
Glenn	Flynt	Mahon
Ashmore	Fountain	Marsh
Baring	Fugua	Martin, Ala.
Beckworth	Gathings	Matthews
Bonner	Gettys	Mills
Buchanan	Gonzalez	Natcher
Burleson	Gross	Nix
Cooley	Haley	O'Neal, Ga.
Davis, Ga.	Hébert	Passman
de la Garza	Henderson	Poage
Dowdy	Herlong	Furcell
Downing	Hull	Quillen
Duncan, Tenn.	Jones, Mo.	Randall

Roberts, Tex.	Teague, Tex.	White, Tex.
Rogers, Tex.	Tuck	Whitener
Satterfield	Tuten	Whitten
Secrest	Utt	Williams
Selden	Waggonner	Willis
Smith, Va.	Walker, Miss.	Young
Stephens	Walker, N. Mex.	
Stubblefield	Watson	

NOT VOTING—42

Anderson, Ill.	Fogarty	O'Hara, Ill.
Andrews	Frelinghuysen	Rivers, Alaska
George W.	Goodell	Rivers, S.C.
Aspinall	Hagan, Ga.	Robison
Bolton	Hansen, Iowa	Roncallo
Burton, Utah	Hardy	Roybal
Carter	Hollifield	St Germain
Colmer	Hosmer	Scott
Daddario	Johnson, Okla.	Thomas
Dawson	Lindsay	Thompson, N.J.
Diggs	Long, La.	Thompson, Tex.
Dorn	Michel	Toll
Dow	Mize	Wilson, Bob
Duncan, Oreg.	Morris	
Edwards, Calif.	Murphy, N.Y.	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Scott against.
 Mr. Dow for, with Mr. Colmer against.
 Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.
 Mr. Daddario for, with Mr. Dorn against.
 Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. Hagan of Georgia against.
 Mr. St Germain for, with Mr. Hardy against.
 Mr. Hollifield for, with Mr. Morris against.
 Mr. Murphy of New York for, with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina against.
 Mr. Rivers of Alaska for, with Mr. George W. Andrews against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Roncallo with Mr. Goodell.
 Mr. O'Hara of Illinois with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
 Mr. Aspinall with Mrs. Bolton.
 Mr. Hansen of Iowa with Mr. Robison.
 Mr. Thomas with Mr. Bob Wilson.
 Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Carter.
 Mr. Dawson with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
 Mr. Diggs with Mr. Lindsay.
 Mr. Roybal with Mr. Hosmer.
 Mr. Edwards with Mr. Michel.
 Mr. Duncan of Oregon with Mr. Mize.
 Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Burton of Utah.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY COMPARABILITY ACT

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10281) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary

Review Commission, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10281, with Mr. DENT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10281. This is an excellent bill that has been carefully thought out and developed through extensive hearings and executive consideration in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. It was reported from our committee by a vote of 20 to 3.

Although I personally feel that increases substantially higher than the 4½-percent initial increase in the bill are fully justified by the record, the bill represents the best measure that could be worked out under the circumstances. I do want to commend the very fine diligence and spirit of cooperation in which all members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee worked together to bring out a bill that can become law this year.

Mr. Chairman, one of the wisest and most foresighted policies ever adopted by the Congress is the principle of comparability between Federal and private enterprise salaries that was written into the statutes by Public Law 87-793. I fully subscribed to that principle, and to the many affirmations by the Congress and by the President that it must be implemented in order to serve the best interests of the Government and its employees.

While the 4½-percent general salary increase scheduled for October 1, 1965, under this bill will not achieve full comparability, it certainly is a step in the right direction. Present Federal salary rates are roughly comparable with those in private enterprise during the February-March period of 1964, so far as concerns the lower pay grades and levels. In the middle and upper grades and levels they compare with private enterprise rates in 1963 and 1962, respectively. Private enterprise levels rose approximately 3 percent more from February and March of 1964 to the same months in 1965. Therefore, at this particular time the lower salary grades and levels in the Government, as now in effect, lag at least 7 or more percent behind comparability with private enterprise levels which they are supposed to match according to Public Law 87-793.

I submit that it would be not only an injustice to the employees—a breach of trust—but also a contradiction of a firm policy adopted by the Congress were this legislation not to include at least the 4½-percent increase.

Aside from the matter of the general salary increases, perhaps the most important part of this bill is section 107, dealing with overtime and holiday pay for postal employees. Section 107 will revamp and modernize the outmoded and unfair treatment of overtime and holiday work that has been in effect, regrettably, for many years.

Many thousands of postal substitutes are called on officially to work heavy overtime schedules—often as much as 60 or 70 or 80 hours a week—at straight time pay. The record shows that literally millions of hours of this kind of overtime is worked each year. It is a shocking thing when we consider that the Federal Government—which should be the leader in enlightened pay policies—has permitted this situation to exist. It is almost unheard of for employees in private industry to work more than 8 hours a day or 40 hours a week or on Sundays without being paid at least time and one-half.

This sorry condition will be remedied by section 107 of our committee bill. All postal field service employees—including substitutes—will be guaranteed time and one-half pay for work officially ordered in excess of 8 hours a day or 40 hours a week. Regular employees will have Monday through Friday workweeks, with authority in the Postmaster General to schedule different workweeks when necessary to provide service, and any work they are called on to perform on Sundays will be overtime, for which they will be paid time and one-half.

This section also updates and clarifies holiday pay provisions for postal employees. Any employee officially ordered to work on one of the eight legal holidays will receive an extra day's pay—that is, double time—except that for work on Christmas Day a further half day's pay will be added, equaling double time and a half.

I should also like to invite the special attention of my colleagues to section 116 of the bill, on page 32. The effect is to increase from \$100 per year to \$150 per year the maximum authorized allowance to employees who are required to wear uniforms in the performance of their duties. The \$100 limit was enacted 11 years ago and I do not think there is any question but that costs of wearing apparel have skyrocketed, along with other living costs, in the meantime. I am confident that my colleagues—and, indeed, the general public—take pride in the clean-cut and well-turned-out appearance that is so typical of our postal letter carriers. This provision of H.R. 10281 is urgently needed to give these fine employees, and others who must wear uniforms, adequate provision for keeping their uniforms up to the fine high standards that are traditional with postal employees.

The bill extends the general salary increase to employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949; all postal field service employees; medical and nursing personnel in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; foreign service officers and employees; Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation County Committee

tend to facilitate achievement of price objectives of the act.

The "global quota" arrangement of the present law would be eliminated. The quota of any country with which the United States severs diplomatic relations would continue to be suspended, but would be allocated promptly to specific countries on a temporary basis.

Because present sugarbeet growers will necessarily have to reduce acreage further as a part of the proposed new program, national acreage reserve provisions contained in the 1962 act, under which new production areas were brought in, would not be extended after 1966.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. sugar industry of course is entitled to change its mind and perhaps has done so on the question of the import fee, but it should be fair-minded in contacting Members of Congress and explain to them that the industry position has changed and why.

It may also be that the U.S. industry was not fully united in its position March 29 of this year on the import fee, and I daresay it is not united right now.

In evaluating the attitude of various interested parties, one should keep in mind the possibility that some U.S. sugar interests may also be heavily involved in foreign sugar, and vice versa.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Is not that fee the same as that which prevailed in prior sugar legislation?

Mr. FINDLEY. It is very similar to the import fee which was assessed against the Dominican Republic during the Eisenhower administration and was in effect in the legislation which operated in 1962, 1963, and 1964.

INSTRUCTOR IN HISTORY WELCOMES VIETCONG VICTORY

(Mr. GALLAGHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I have just read on the wire that an instructor in history at Drew University, James Mellen, has declared himself as welcoming a Vietcong victory in Vietnam.

This despite over a hundred thousand American soldiers fighting to prevent such a victory. This despite American and Vietnamese being killed to prevent such a victory. It is just quite possible that this self-proclaimed Marxist is trying to attract a little attention to himself. I am sure the Republic will survive. It has survived the early "Mellenheaded" thinking of Benedict Arnold who wished a victory for the other side when this country was engaged in another war.

Having once served on the faculty at Rutgers University I believe completely in academic freedom, even the free and full expression of fools in and out of academic circles and, therefore, I recognize Mr. Mellen's right to full expression. And I have a right to find his view appalling and disgraceful as well as unenlightened. He obviously does not know what a Vietcong victory entails.

When I was in Vietnam I saw what a Vietcong victory meant in some villages.

It meant the mayor's head on a fence post. It meant hands chopped off. It meant young men dragged off for training against their will. It meant the stealing of all village food and medical supplies in the name of liberation. It meant the displacement of hope with fear. All because the South Vietnamese find it objectionable that they surrender their freedom to something called the liberation front, alias the Vietcong, alias the Communist army of North Vietnam.

Mr. Mellen, in proclaiming himself a Marxist, would indicate that while he is an instructor of history, he has not learned well the lessons of history. Even the Russian leaders admit that pure Marxism is unworkable. And everyone knows that history has never disclosed one country that has chosen communism in a free election.

It is common knowledge that the Vietcong are having some difficulty with their recruiting drive. Since Mr. Mellen has such strong convictions about welcoming a Vietcong victory, perhaps he should be given the opportunity to fight with the Vietcong and thus translate his words into a more meaningful note. I would be very happy to intercede in his behalf in making the necessary arrangements. Perhaps we could trade him for some of the American prisoners of war before they are murdered in cold blood by the Vietcong as were the two Americans last week.

In fact, some of our protesting students calling for a Vietcong victory could be included in such a trade and thus the Vietcong would have new recruits and we would save the lives of courageous Americans who are fighting to save the freedom Mr. Mellen and his ilk would have us abandon.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority leader if he will kindly advise us as to the program for tomorrow and of any other information he cares to state.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the program previously announced we will have up tomorrow the conference report on the foreign aid appropriation bill. This is, of course, a very important matter. Members might expect a vote on that conference report.

In addition, we will take up, as previously announced, House Joint Resolution 642, which is the James Madison Memorial Library; H.R. 3142, the Medical Library Assistance Act; and H.R. 6519, the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial Act.

HOURLY OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON SHOULD VETO THE NEW IMMIGRATION ACT

(Mr. GONZALEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have long supported reform of our outdated immigration law and abolition of the infamous national origin system. When the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 was before the House in August, I voted for it and against all crippling amendments. One of the crippling amendments that I, along with the leadership, opposed then was a proposal to place a quota on immigration from the Western Hemisphere. The House wisely rejected this proposal. But the Senate version of the bill contained an almost identical provision, establishing a quota of 120,000 persons a year on immigration from the Western Hemisphere. This was one of the most important differences between the two bills. In my opinion, it was the most important difference. The bills went to conference and, as we all know, the conference report recommended adoption of the Senate provision. I offered a motion to recommit the report back to the conference with instruction to reject the Senate amendment establishing a quota for the Western Hemisphere. After my motion failed I voted against adoption of the conference report. I could not in good conscience vote for a so-called reform measure which merely transfers a bad practice from one part of the world to another.

We who have justly criticized the Iron Curtain, Bamboo Curtain, and the Berlin wall have reason to ponder about what we have done to our own hemisphere today. We have, in my judgment, lowered a paper curtain and raised a wall of red tape around our borders. What is worse, these devices are aimed against the peoples of this hemisphere with whom we claim to be partners, neighbors, and even brothers.

The Western Hemisphere quota is ill-advised and unnecessary. Secretary Rusk expressed his strong opposition to it when he said that the amendment would, in effect, place obstacles in the path leading to cordial and harmonious relations with Latin America. It is no secret, for example, that under the language of the amendment, any one country such as Canada could entirely preempt the quota for any year by sending into the United States 120,000 immigrants. Who is to say that the persons administering the new law would not permit this? And what would be the effects on the Latin nations?

It is an unnecessary provision because under the present law immigration from the countries of the Western Hemisphere over the past 10 years has averaged only 110,000. With this new law we are thus creating a problem where there has been no problem in the past.

The favored treatment of the nations of this hemisphere whereby no quota is placed on immigration was granted in the act of 1924 for reasons which are still valid today. Our feelings of hemispheric solidarity go back to the Monroe Doctrine. Our faith in the good neighbor policy and pan-American friendship was reaffirmed with the Alliance for Progress. The quota on immigration from the Western Hemisphere approved by the House today is shattering to this faith.

I am therefore asking President Johnson to veto the Immigration and Nationality Act. The pledges we have made to all the peoples of the Americas of friendship and brotherhood must be upheld, or like bad checks, they will come back one day to haunt us.

(Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. HORTON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MORSE'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. HORTON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MORSE'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE EDUCATIONAL POLICY OF UCCA

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. HORTON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there are numerous dedicated groups in the country effectively representing their unique membership and maintaining a legitimate interest in subject matter within their jurisdiction. An organization which fits the description I have just given is the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

Its president, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, is a noted economist and authority on the Soviet Union.

Dr. Dobriansky produced a very timely article for the Ukrainian Quarterly's Autumn 1965 edition which I insert in the Record at this point as part of my remarks:

[From the Ukrainian Quarterly, Autumn, 1965]

THE EDUCATIONAL POLICY OF UCCA

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

In the past 15 years many changes have taken place in every part of this world. The changes have been of every conceivable character—economic, technological, political, social, religious, cultural, and so forth. Any organization that has attracted international as well as domestic interest would necessarily have to take account of such changes if this rich interest is to be intensified and broadened. The policy position of the organization must be periodically interpreted in terms of the changed conditions, its programs must

be prudently adapted to the new circumstances, and its publications and literary contributions must reflect a steady awareness of the currents and cross-currents abroad in the world.

Significantly, as shifting conditions have warranted it, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America has at intervals defined and elaborated in the simplest and most precise terms possible the nature and objectives of its general policy. It has forthrightly stated and restated its position to innumerable inquirers who have raised the usual questions: "What are you for and against?", "Are you supported by foreign sources?", "Are you an emigré organization?", and "What are your purposes and aims?" Some, like the Washington Post in 1963, have mischaracterized the organization as one of the most powerful lobbies on Capitol Hill; others, like our recent Presidents, have properly viewed it as a citizens group contributing to the welfare of this Nation; while still others, like the organs of colonialist Moscow and puppet Kiev, have furnished a series of hallucinations about the organization. The answers and replies have always been, so to speak, on open record and in the books, even for those with short memories or those suffering pains of uncertainty or changed allegiance.

As far back as 1951, for example, the committee offered its concrete responses to the problems that were then pressing and outstanding.¹ Taking full cognizance of numerous developments at home and in the world, it again stated its policy clearly and distinctly 6 years later.² In March 1965, UCCA expressed itself once more as to the nature and structure of its policy in the light of changes over the past 8 years. As in the preceding years, this action was necessary because of the never-ending inquiries, the forgetfulness of some, the healthiness of a periodic reexamination, and the doubts of a few who have been misled by superficial developments in the Red empire and elsewhere.

The remarkable aspect of all these policy statements is the basic continuity of what are essentially principles and guidelines to a completely educational policy of UCCA. The 1957 statement, for instance, did not waver in this fundamental respect from the previous one, despite notable changes in the world such as the death of Stalin, the Pereyaslav Treaty concessions, the abortive Hungarian revolution, the sputnik, and a host of other developments. Some individuals read too much into several of these changes and went hopelessly astray. As is often the case, changes in degree are mistaken for changes in kind, transformed appearances are misinterpreted for substantive modifications. In addition, mistakes of this sort usually reveal frail convictions, not to say tenuous knowledge.

Since 1957 to the very present who can deny the sweeping changes that have marked contemporary history? The tremendous economic strides of the United States, Western Europe, and other parts of the free world, the space explorations of this period, captive Cuba, the weakening of NATO, the Sino-Soviet Russian rift, the economic troubles of the Red Empire, Sino-Russian infiltration of Latin America, Africa, and southeast Asia, Vietnam and numerous other significant developments can be cited. Each of these has to be rationally considered when one speaks of a policy that is fixed in principle but not static in content, flexible for operation but not naive in pragmatism, founded on certitude but not sterile in action. Each of these changes and more were carefully

¹"The Political Policy of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America," the Ukrainian Quarterly, vol. VII, No. 1, pp. 52-64.

²"UCCA Policy Today," the Ukrainian Quarterly, vol. XIII, No. 4, pp. 297-304.

taken account of as the 1965 educational policy of UCCA was developed and accepted by its executive bodies. As in every instance, this policy can be democratically revised at the UCCA conventions, but in view of the firm and tested continuity of this policy, the likelihood of any substantial revision is virtually nil.

TEN POLICY POINTS

The educational policy of UCCA rests on 10 fundamental points. These really constitute the principles and guidelines of UCCA action. Dealing with norms, purposes, objectives, and principles, the 10 points naturally cannot provide ready answers to all problem situations. To expect this is to demand omniscience. The vain and actually absurd pretention of omniscience can best be left with the Red totalitarians. However, in the necessary interplay of theory and practice, idea and act, these points do provide a base for a rational treatment of pertinent problems, regardless of how complex they may be. The recurring plan of complexity is no excuse for inaction or muddled performance.

I. PRIMARY CONTRIBUTION TO THE NATIONAL SECURITY OF UNITED STATES

Preceding all others, the first cardinal point of UCCA's educational policy is work and effort aimed at preserving and strengthening the national security of the United States. This has been and is the most fundamental objective of UCCA, and its accomplishment is being progressively realized through the many unique channels open to it. In one of his messages to a UCCA convention President Harry S. Truman underscored this point and stated that, "The natural desire of all peoples for a free way of life will be strengthened as the true story of democracy is made known in lands where distortion has become an art of government."³ This includes the United States as well as Ukraine and all the captive nations. It includes Russia. The statement alludes to only one of the functions of UCCA.

We cannot repeat too often the famous declaration of our late President John F. Kennedy, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country." For us, this epitomized the spirit and action of UCCA long before it was uttered and appeared in print. If any group has hammered away at the truth that without a strong and courageous America, to which every citizen must contribute, the cause of freedom would be lost throughout the world, it is certainly this national organization. Freedom for Ukraine and for all the captive nations would be truly a grand illusion. Dedicated to our American traditions of democracy and independence, as expressed by the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, and the Constitution, UCCA is a completely American institution, a national organization, that draws upon a wealth of Ukrainian resourcefulness and experience to do what it can for our country and thus, in the world context, for the eventual liberation and freedom of all the captive nations, including the largest of them in Eastern Europe, Ukraine itself.

Contrary to illusions held by some, UCCA is not, nor has ever been, an ersatz Ukrainian parliament, a government-in-exile, or an agent for any government-in-exile. Where these fanciful notions have arisen, it is difficult to say. However, various reasons inspiring and promoting such notions are not difficult to surmise. Any attempt to compromise the character of this essentially educational institution—which is one of Americans of Ukrainian background infused with a free Kozak spirit—and to

³ Message of the President of the United States, the Ukrainian Bulletin, July 15-August 1, 1952, p. 1.

September 30, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

24703

Mr. HARTKE. Let me help the Senator out in that regard.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We will manufacture our share of the steel.

Mr. HARTKE. The average U.S. automobile takes over 3,000 pounds of steel and iron.

We are going to lose 200,000 automobiles. That makes 300,000 tons that ordinarily would be produced in the United States.

Each automobile takes about 45 pounds of copper, which means that 9 million pounds of copper will not be sold from the United States, 15 million pounds of aluminum, 25 million pounds of zinc, and 8 million pounds of lead and other products, mined in the United States.

It means a loss of about \$400 million in the United States in sales alone.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Will the Senator suspend for one moment?

Mr. HARTKE. All I can say is—

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator wants the floor, I will be glad to yield the floor, but if the Senator is asking a question I would like to respond.

Mr. HARTKE. I want to know if the Senator has taken all jobs into consideration in his estimate of what is going to happen to business in the United States.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I will state what I have taken into account.

What the Senator is taking about is future growth of the Canadian automobile market. He said we are losing that. I say that it is a doubtful assumption that we ever owned that market. So far as what we are sending there is concerned, we are keeping it.

Mr. HARTKE. In response to that, I wish to read from the Canadian press. They are pretty good. I wish to read an article by John Fell from the Canadian Globe and Mail. He said:

The plan is designed to cut the imbalance of trade with the United States, increase Canadian employment, maintain production of autos in this country in the same sales-to-production ratio as in 1964, and increase the Canadian content of autos by stipulated amounts.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have taken all of that into account.

I arrived at the conclusion, which was testified to by every responsible official of our Government and those who represent labor and management as well, that this means an increase in jobs in the U.S. industry; that it means we will preserve 25,000 jobs that we are in danger of losing if we do not ratify this agreement in the automobile industry alone, and another 25,000 jobs in supporting industries; and that this agreement means more profits for business; it means expansion of business and lower prices for the consumer.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President—

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I have a very brief statement I would like to make supporting this agreement, and supporting the position taken by the Senator from Louisiana.

It is my hope and expectation that I shall not exceed more than 10 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then, Mr. President, will the Senator yield without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. SMATHERS. If I may finish that sentence.

I am certain it is the desire of all Senators to get a vote on this bill in a short time.

Now, I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield with that understanding.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the Gore motion to postpone action on the pending bill until the second Monday in January occur at 4 o'clock this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I want to be certain that I may have 5 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Kansas requires so little time that he has assurance that he will have 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of Senators, especially those who are opposing the pending business, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. If it is agreeable, I should like to have the Senate take up the conference report on the immigration bill at this time. The time taken on the conference report would be added to the period after 4 o'clock, so that no time would be lost.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of September 29, 1965, pp. 24547-24551, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, H.R. 2580 passed the Senate on Wednesday, September 22, by a vote of 76 to 18. The measure considered by the Senate was an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the House-passed bill. The House asked for a conference to consider and resolve the nine

areas of substantive difference between the two bills that resulted from the work of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The Senate amendment enlarging the definition of refugees in section 203(a)(7) to include those persons uprooted from their usual place of abode by catastrophic natural calamity, as defined by the President, was accepted by the House.

The conferees agreed to provide in section 4 of the bill that immigration officers, as well as consular officials, may administer oaths executed outside of the United States.

The Senate amendment removing the exclusion of alien seamen from section 244, thus allowing such aliens to seek a suspension of deportation from the Attorney General, was accepted by the House.

The conferees agreed, however, to allow for such suspension proceedings only for seamen who entered prior to June 30, 1964.

The Senate amendment liberalizing the House amendment to permit aliens afflicted by mental retardation or past attacks of mental illness to seek entrance as immigrants under the procedures described in section 212(f) was accepted by the House.

The Senate amendment to extend the benefits of section 249, to permit the creation of a record of lawful admission to aliens who entered the United States, was agreed to in principle by the House. The Senate would have raised the pertinent date from June 28, 1940, to June 28, 1958. The conferees agreed on a compromise date of June 30, 1948.

The Senate amendment establishing a conditional limitation of 120,000 upon the nations of the Western Hemisphere and the creation of a Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration was accepted by the House. The conferees agreed to change the composition of the Commission from three members from the House and Senate each, and nine members appointed by the President to five members from the House and Senate each, and five appointed by the President.

It was agreed that no more than three members from the House and three from the Senate would be from the same political party.

The Senate amendment to section 245 allowing the adjustment of status of natives from the Western Hemisphere who have fled persecution on account of race, religion or political opinion was not accepted by the House. The conferees did agree, however, to the specific inclusion of this problem in the mandate to the Select Commission.

Finally, a minor Senate amendment providing that an alien student must show evidence that he has been accepted by an approved educational institution was deleted. Such a requirement substantially exists under current law.

Mr. President, the Senate conferees believe that this conference was most successful in preserving the amendments introduced by the Senate. The House conferees were most accommodating and generous to us in this matter. I take this opportunity to express my apprecia-

24704

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 30, 1965

tion to Chairman Celler of the House Judiciary Committee and his colleagues.

I also express my deep appreciation to my own colleagues for their diligence and patience throughout this extended, but harmonious, conference meeting. Senators ERVIN, HART, FONG, and JAVITS argued most eloquently and successfully for the Senate position on various matters, as did the distinguished minority leader, Senator DIRKSEN.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I agree with much of what the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has said. I wish to pay him a tribute for the taste and fine leadership he displayed in the conference.

There are two matters upon which I wish to comment. The first is the question of the ceiling on Western Hemisphere immigration to the United States. I do not favor such a ceiling. I was strongly opposed to it in the subcommittee, in the full committee, and on the Senate floor. We all understand that the bill is a package deal and includes a Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration to consider whether the imposition of a ceiling, after an exhaustive study of the situation in the future, is the right policy. Without such a package, we would not have had a bill in the Senate. The House conferees, recognizing this situation, nonetheless went along with this proposition.

I am convinced, and I think those who feel strongly against the imposition of the ceiling on Western Hemisphere immigration should also feel convinced, that this important legislation would not be here, and the Senator from Massachusetts would have been unable to be in this posture of final action on a bill, were not the whole package accepted.

It is fair to say, and I believe it is most important to say, that a determined effort was made by some in conference to strike out the Commission. It required much effort and persuasion on the part of the Senate conferees, together with a conviction on the part of a number of House conferees, to cause the acceptance of the Commission. That was critically important, because it is really the only ameliorating factor and, based upon the factual advice the Commission may give us, a better policy may be provided to substitute for the ceiling which we placed on Western Hemisphere immigration. It should be made absolutely clear that none of us who feel as I do have altered our views upon that subject. Our Latin American friends should understand that, otherwise we would have had no bill at all; also that the ceiling maintains approximately the present rate of immigration; in addition that the Commission is under a duty to submit a preliminary report on or before July 1, 1967, which is before the ceiling on Latin American immigration will take effect on July 1, 1968. This will give Congress an opportunity, in the light of an authoritative set of findings, to reconsider the policy if it wishes to do so.

In the same connection, I wish to pay tribute, as I have before, to the statesmanship of the distinguished senior Sen-

ator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. I did not agree with him in this matter at all; he did not agree with me. But he did agree in the final analysis that there should be a bill, and he found himself able, in good conscience, to accept the totality of this package without which a bill would not have been possible. I am satisfied as to that.

The proudest words in any language that can be offered to a man of intellect, whether one agrees with him or not, are, "I am persuaded." This is my tribute to the Senator from North Carolina.

I am deeply disappointed about one aspect of the bill, as to which we ran into a brick wall, an absolute rock, so far as the House conferees were concerned, and that is the adjustment of the status of Cuban refugees in the United States, of whom there are some 225,000, in temporary status in the United States, many of whom find their progress materially interfered with in terms of getting licenses to practice professions and in terms, even, of getting licenses to engage in certain kinds of business, because their status is still that of parolees. In the last 2 years, 15,335 and 11,899 Cubans entered.

What has been done by denying them the opportunity to readjust their situation without leaving the country is, in my judgment, to prefer those who can afford to go to Canada or to Mexico and remain the requisite time to become normal immigrants, instead of permitting these people, many of whom were heroes who preferred freedom to continued residence under communism in their own homes to enjoy normal lives. We should at least give them the same treatment that we have given, for example, ship-jumpers and others who are in this country in an irregular status and whose status we permit to be regularized under the bill.

Mr. President, I am bitterly disappointed by that. I believe that we are making a great mistake. However, I am convinced, as are my colleagues, that we would have had no bill and we would have shattered the whole vessel of immigration reform upon that rock.

The bill has been amended to require the Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration to look into this express question. I expect that the Commission will have a preliminary report within about a year. There was an expression of sympathy with the idea of perhaps preparing a separate bill for the Cuban refugees based upon the findings of the Commission. This action would answer the deep complaint which I feel that thousands of people will properly have as a result of the impasse which developed from this provision of the Senate bill.

Mr. President, it is for the reason that I want to cooperate in this great reform that I signed the conference report. I pledge myself to continue to work indefatigably for the future well-being of Cuban refugees. I feel that they are entitled to the same rights as are the many other categories of immigrants covered in the immigration law. I intend to prepare legislation in this regard.

I thank my colleague for his indulgence.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I approve of the conference report.

I should like to say that, although the distinguished Senators from Massachusetts and New York differ with me on the desirability of placing a limitation upon immigration from the Western Hemisphere, they did an exceedingly fine job and merit the thanks of the Senate for their work on this legislation which now nears fruition.

I believe that one of the most meritorious features of the bill is the limitation on immigration from the Western Hemisphere. The provision for this limitation removes one of the serious defects in our existing immigration law in that it removes the discrimination in favor of the nations of the Western Hemisphere as against the nations of the Eastern Hemisphere.

Although there may be no great hemispheric immigration problem at present, it is better to lock the stable door before the horse is stolen.

The countries of the Western Hemisphere, outside the United States, had a population of approximately 67 million people at the beginning of this century. At the end of this century it is estimated that the same countries will have a population of approximately 600 million people. The United States simply cannot absorb unrestricted immigration from the Western Hemisphere.

I believe that the bill is the best obtainable at this time in our Nation's history. I believe that we will offend our Latin American neighbors less by placing a limitation upon immigration from South America and the West Indies, as well as the independent countries of North America, outside the United States, now, before a great many of the 600 million people demand entrance to this country.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement regarding the conference report on H.R. 2580, the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Mr. President, when H.R. 2580, the Immigration and Nationality Act, passed the Senate on September 22, I voted against it because of two aspects of it which disturbed me.

One was a provision relating to the thousands of Cubans already in this country who fled that unhappy island because of Castro. The Senate bill would have had the effect of conferring U.S. citizenship on these unfortunate people without the normal waiting period, and therefore without any adequate screening process. While I deeply sympathize with these refugees from Communist tyranny, I think it would be extremely unwise to confer citizenship upon them on a wholesale basis without the traditional screening and waiting period. In addition, such action by our Congress would suggest that we expect these good people never to return to their native land and this would imply that we feel Castro's Communist regime is a permanent thing in Cuba. Of course, this is not the case at all.

September 30, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

The conferees have removed this Cuban provision from the bill, and that removes one of the objections I had to it.

My other objection to the bill grew out of part of the debate on it on the day of its passage. During that debate Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, who was managing the bill for its proponents, admitted under questioning that under it 60,000 more immigrants per year would enter this country than the total annual number currently admitted under existing law. I was disturbed by this figure in the light of the present unemployment situation. Since that day I have given further study to the matter and have discussed it with Senators who are thoroughly informed on it and am now convinced this figure is an overestimate. In addition and more important, the new law would place a much greater emphasis on admission of persons with professional and technical skills so that a very large proportion of the additional immigrants would fall into these categories and would not add to the unskilled labor supply in this country, which type of labor accounts for a large part of the unemployment problem. Thus, the new law would help us meet existing shortages in many areas of our economy where skilled professional and technical workers are sorely needed. And, finally, because of the new limitation on total immigration from the Western Hemisphere, of which Senator ERVIN is the author, the overall effect of the new law over a period of years will be to hold down the total influx into our country, particularly of unskilled labor.

Mr. President, I want to join with many others in paying tribute to my colleague, the senior Senator from North Carolina, for the magnificent contribution he has made during many hours of hard work on the perfecting of what I believe is now an immigration plan considerably superior to that provided under the present immigration laws.

I therefore want to go on record as favoring adoption of the conference report and enactment of this bill into law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

COMMENDATION OF FRED M. MESMER, DRURY H. BLAIR, AND GEORGE B. AUTRY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, it would be impossible for Members of the Senate to perform the tasks devolving upon them in their character as Federal legislators if it were not for the dedicated devotion and untiring zeal of members of their staffs and members of the staffs of various committees and subcommittees upon which they serve. Since last February, I have devoted a major part of my energy and time to the study of the laws and problems relating to immigration in connection with the revision of our immigration laws covered by the conference report which has just been approved by the Senate.

In my judgment, these revised laws constitute the best immigration regulations which can be devised and enacted

at this particular time. I would like to thank Fred M. Mesmer and Drury H. Blair, staff members of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, and George B. Autry, Chief Counsel of the Subcommittee on Revision and Codification of the Laws, for invaluable assistance which they gave to me in connection with my work upon this legislation, and to bear testimony that they merit the thanks of the Senate for the contributions which they made to the preparation and enactment of this legislation.

AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS TRADE ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9042) to provide for the implementation of the Agreement Concerning Automotive Products Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana has very excellently described the features of the bill and of the Canadian agreement. I favor the agreement and I urge enactment of this bill to implement it.

This bill has been explored about as thoroughly as any legislation to come before the Committee on Finance. We had 4½ days of hearings on it and took nearly 500 pages of testimony. On the basis of these hearings and the subsequent discussions in executive session, only three members of the committee were able to find fault with it.

The objective of the agreement and of this bill is to expand trade with Canada through mutual elimination of duties. Canada has acted to eliminate her duties and this bill carries out our obligation to eliminate ours. In entering into this agreement, Canada probably fears she gave up more than she got. Canadian duties are 17.5 percent on automobiles, and up to 25 percent on parts. Our duties are only a fraction of that. On automobiles it is 6.5 percent and on parts it is only 8.5 percent. In addition, Canada was compelled to scrap her tariff rebate plan under which Canadian exports of parts to this country had soared.

Because Canada felt she was not getting a quid pro quo, commitments were obtained from Canadian subsidiaries of American automobile companies that their Canadian production will be expanded over a 4-year period despite elimination of the duties. Without this assurance, the greater efficiency of American automobile and part manufacturers would have overwhelmed Canadian competitors.

By the company undertakings, Canadian production is to be expanded by 60 percent of growth in Canadian auto sales plus an absolute amount of \$241 million. This latter commitment by the terms of undertakings is to be achieved by the end of model year 1968. An obvious purpose of these undertakings is to provide time for the less efficient Canadian manufacturers to become more efficient through longer production runs of fewer models so that they will be better able to compete with American man-

ufacturers after the commitments expire.

Under the agreement as implemented by this bill, Canadian manufacturers will be able to concentrate their production in such a way that fewer models will be produced at greater efficiency. Models no longer produced in Canada will be provided by exports from the United States. Of course, we will be receiving some Canadian cars in return.

This exchange was not possible before the President entered into this agreement because of the very high Canadian tariff on automobiles and because of our own tariff. It will be possible now. An exchange of this sort which increases the exports of both countries will, of course, help both countries.

On the basis of testimony presented to the committee, I believe, and I know that other members of the committee agree, that our favorable balance of trade and payments with Canada will not be harmed because of the agreement or the company commitments. The Canadian market for automobiles is growing so rapidly—even more rapidly than the U.S. demand—that it will be possible for the companies to satisfy their commitments to Canada without any net exports to this country.

Thus, the Treasury Department advised the committee that at the end of the transition period—model year 1968—our balance of trade and our balance of payments in automotive products with Canada will be the same as it is today. If we do not approve the agreement by passing this enabling legislation, our balance of payments could be seriously hurt, because we will lose the large export market we now have.

Canada has demonstrated that she is going to have an automobile industry. In 1963, she began steps to expand her auto industry. This involved remission of duties on imported auto parts. The U.S. parts industry objected to this remission plan, called it a subsidy and moved for a countervailing duty under our law. Others saw the plan for what it really was—an attempt by Canada to create an autonomous automobile industry within her own boundaries. If we had not resorted to this agreement, other methods Canada might have employed to achieve her objective could have cut off U.S. automotive exports to Canada. This is exactly what happened in Brazil when she went to a 100-percent local content requirement in 1958. This is exactly what is happening today in Argentina and Australia. We lost exports to all these countries.

By this agreement with Canada, I believe we have protected the American automobile industry from loss of the Canadian market. I believe we have protected America from loss of a half-billion-dollar favorable balance of trade with Canada. That is a real achievement.

Mr. President, whenever we find labor and industry and the administration all supporting the same legislation, it must be good. That is the happy state of affairs with respect to H.R. 9042. The Government sponsored it—the industry urges it—labor supports it.

24706

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 30, 1965

The legislation before us is clearly historic. Canada, which has been seeking to establish a separate automotive industry of its own, has now committed itself to an integration of its automotive market with that of its neighbor, the United States. The integration is somewhat conditioned, it is true. But such conditioning is quite understandable as both nations move through the transitional period toward a rationalized North American automotive market. And the development of this market will stand in marked contrast to the restrictive trade practices which characterized attempts by other countries to establish their own automotive industry.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I should like to finish my statement. Then I shall be very happy to yield.

With respect to the balance-of-trade and balance-of-payments deficits, Merlyn N. Trued, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, had this to say:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you to comment on the balance-of-payments implications of the proposed legislation to implement the United States-Canadian Automotive Products Agreement.

As this committee knows, the United States has had a substantial overall surplus on trade account with Canada, over the years. Our automotive trade with Canada has contributed substantially to that surplus.

He then quoted Secretary of Commerce Connor:

With the automotive products agreement in force, Secretary Connor testified before the committee that: "It is reasonable to project a continuing growth in the Canadian automotive market sufficient to absorb the projected increase in Canadian production without reducing our net favorable balance of trade with Canada."

The Treasury supports this conclusion.

To continue with the statement of Mr. Trued:

From a balance-of-payments viewpoint, then, the automotive agreement simply means this: Under it, we stand to maintain our present sizable surplus with Canada in automotive trade. Without the agreement, we stand to lose a part of our present surplus. There is no doubt in the administration's mind of this outcome, and I believe other Government witnesses have indicated their firm judgment that, in the absence of the agreement, Canada would undertake measures to limit imports from the United States and I might add, Mr. Chairman, your comments at the conclusion of Secretary Wirtz' testimony are perfectly fitted to that result.

There is another balance-of-payments consideration that I would like to mention briefly in this context. It relates to investment in Canada. The means of financing investments in the automotive industry in Canada in recent years have been reinvestment of local earnings and borrowing in the Canadian market. As Secretary Connor has stated, this pattern will probably continue. That probability is heightened by the fact that under the agreement the companies will have substantial savings from the waiver of Canadian duties they would otherwise have had to pay. This means that any additional investment resulting from the companies' undertakings should involve little, if any, cash transfers from the United States.

The agreement does not accomplish all that the Canadian Government might have hoped. It does not accomplish all that we in the United States were seeking. But it does represent a fair and reasonable compromise which serves the interests of both countries.

I believe the agreement has many advantages to the United States over the Canadian duty remissions plan the agreement replaces. I believe, for that matter, that the agreement will leave us ahead of where we were before Canada embarked upon the unilateral course of action which she may well resume if this agreement is rejected.

Where, under her duty remissions plan Canada sought to solve her automotive trade problems solely by stimulating her exports, she now proposes, under the agreement, to work out the answer through increased Canadian automotive production. This is an approach which leaves the way open for the United States to maintain its highly favorable automotive trade surplus, but at a higher trade level which would make the proportions of her deficit acceptable to Canada.

The agreement puts U.S. producers of replacement auto parts on a more equal footing with their Canadian competitors, who could generate exports that could be used to obtain duty remission under the old plan. And the agreement redefines "Canadian content" requirements in a manner that gives U.S. original equipment parts manufacturers a freer hand to sell in Canada than they had under the remission plan or, for that matter, even before the plan was put into effect. They are no longer restricted to duty-free treatment of only those parts of a class or kind not made in Canada. The agreement pertains to all original equipment parts.

Viewed from the perspective of overall automotive trade, I find nothing in this agreement to cause us alarm. The short-range trade effects will be to reduce very slightly the U.S. share in the immediate growth of the Canadian auto market. Specifically, as I have said, the automotive manufacturers have agreed to increase Canadian content by \$241 million more than normal growth by 1968. In the context of the Canadian market, that is a substantial sum—about half of Canada's automotive trade deficit in 1963. In the huge bucket of the U.S. auto market, this business lost to Canada will be little more than a drop—less than 1 percent of the total North American market which must be compared with the 8.5 percent industry growth rate of 1965 over the previous year.

In the longer range, the agreement will stimulate the growth of the North American market. It will permit the Canadian industry to work toward the production of fewer models and component parts, while American plants supply the Canadian market with other models and other parts. The end result will be a more logical, more efficient North American automotive industry to better serve the market. What we will have, in other words, is a slightly smaller share of a much larger pie—netting us more pro-

duction, more trade, and more employment.

The basic question confronting us in implementing the automotive products trade agreement is not whether this is the best of all possible solutions—I for one would prefer to see completely free automotive trade between ourselves and Canada—but whether it is the best solution available in the light of both the mutual and conflicting objectives of two sovereign governments. I submit that it is.

The net effects of the agreement, I am convinced, are all to the good. Nevertheless, a prime concern must be the adequate protection of those U.S. companies and their employees who may be adversely affected by the realignment of production.

I am pleased to see that the legislation before us contains provisions which, in my estimation, will provide effective relief for such dislocations. These special provisions involve eligibility for assistance and administrative procedures. They are fully justified because this agreement calls for immediate elimination of tariffs instead of their gradual reduction as would be the case in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Therefore, any adverse effects may be experienced more rapidly. These special provisions are necessary to provide aid to firms and workers who are affected by loss of export markets as well as by increased imports of particular products.

In considering the effect of H.R. 9042 on American companies and workers, it is important that we consider not only the consequences of not implementing the agreement as well.

As the Secretary of Labor pointed out in committee hearings, at least 25,000 U.S. jobs are involved directly in the production of autos and auto parts for export to Canada, and at least as many more workers are indirectly involved. In 1964, we exported about \$660 million in automotive items to Canada while importing less than one-tenth as much from Canada. Whether we speak in terms of dollars or jobs, clearly we stand to lose more than we could possibly gain by any action that disrupts Canada-United States auto trade relations. Conversely, we stand to gain more than we lose through any agreement which, like the one we are considering today, will promote the flow of trade. Implementation of this agreement may displace some workers. Failure to implement the agreement runs the high risk of displacing many more, very soon. It would also deprive us in the longer run of the additional United States jobs that will be required to meet the needs of a more rapidly expanding Canadian auto market.

Mr. President, nothing could be more unfortunate than to consider H.R. 9042 as legislation which helps only the major automobile producers and concerns only the automotive industry.

That the major automobile manufacturers will benefit is undeniably true. But the important point is that the rest of the automotive industry and the national economy will also be helped by

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 111

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1965

No. 180

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of Scripture: Luke 21: 19: *In your patience ye shall win your souls.*

O eternal God, in whose divine control are all our days, we beseech Thee to draw us now near to Thyself that we may not be far from one another.

May we offer our noonday prayer with one heart and mind and with simple faith and sincere love.

Amid all the changes of each passing day may we find in Thee that peace and that patience and perseverance which the world can neither give nor take away.

Whatever Thy will may be for us this day grant that we may serve Thee faithfully and with firm obedience to what Thou dost command.

Thou hast mercifully drawn a cloud over the future but may this not be a weariness or a vexation of spirit but a comfort and a joy that the best is yet to be.

May each new day with its troubles and difficulties be part of the curriculum for the development of our character and the culture of the inner life.

To Thy name we shall give all the praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1274. An act for the relief of Mrs. Michiko Miyazaki Williams.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 7743. An act to establish a system of loan insurance and a supplementary system of direct loans, to assist students to attend postsecondary business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools; and

H.R. 9247. An act to provide for participation of the United States in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition to be held in San Antonio, Tex., in 1968, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1065. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire through exchange the Great Falls property in the State of Virginia for administration in connection with the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and for other purposes; and

S. 1620. An act to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 728) entitled "An act to amend section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936."

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendments Nos. 1, 2, and 3 to the bill (H.R. 205) to amend chapter 35 of title 38 of the United States Code in order to increase the educational assistance allowances payable under the war orphans' educational assistance program, and for other purposes.

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. CELLER, FEIGHAN, CHELF, RODINO, DONOHUE, BROOKS, MCCULLOCH, MOORE, and CAHILL.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees

may have until midnight tonight and tomorrow night to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO REVISE AND EXTEND

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may speak today in Committee of the Whole may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 335]

Anderson, Ill.	Downing	McEwen
Andrews,	Flood	Michel
George W.	Frelinghuysen	Mize
Aspinall	Goodell	O'Hara, Mich.
Blatnik	Hansen, Wash.	Powell
Bolton	Hardy	Rivers, S.C.
Bonner	Hébert	Roncallo
Brademas	Holifield	Roosevelt
Brown, Calif.	Hosmer	Scott
Colmer	Johnson, Okla.	Thomas
Daddario	Landrum	Thompson, N.J.
Davis, Wis.	Lindsay	Toll
Dorn	Long, La.	Tupper

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 393 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CONVEY PROPERTY TO SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the

24499

Immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 7329) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in the United States to the city of San Diego, Calif.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 7329

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services shall convey, without monetary consideration therefor, to the city of San Diego, California, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property comprising a portion (approximately sixty-seven one-hundredths of an acre) of the Navy Capehart quarters at the Admiral Hartman site in San Diego, California, the exact legal description of which property shall be determined by the Administrator.

With the following committee amendment:

On line 4, strike out "without monetary consideration therefor" and insert in lieu thereof "at the estimated fair market value".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 313 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "aye." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 4644 and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4644) to provide an elected Mayor, City Council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 4644, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute offered yesterday by the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK]. The substitute which the gentleman offered has had full committee consideration and full committee hearings.

In fact, the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] testified on behalf of his substitute, which was then pending before the committee in the form of a bill, for one full morning, and then came back the following day and subjected himself to further questioning.

This substitute, or bill, has obtained the approval of a duly constituted committee of the House of Representatives, not a clandestine group or a clandestine meeting made up of a group of "yes" men.

Incidentally, while I was in the Army during the war, we had another name for "yes" men.

The committee, in approving the Sisk substitute, approved it with a committee amendment; however, the committee amendment to the original Sisk bill did not lessen the committee support of the basic principle of the Sisk bill. Actually, what the committee did was to put two bills together.

The committee put two bills together. The bill I had originally introduced would provide for 85 percent of the land area of the District of Columbia to be retroceded to the State of Maryland. I believe, of course, this would be the only way in which we could provide the maximum amount of self-government to any of the people who live within the Nation's Capital at this time. This is no question about the constitutionality of this proposal. Actually, a large portion of the district I now represent, Arlington County and the city of Alexandria, used to be a part of the original District of Columbia. Be that as it may, I have been advised unofficially that the committee amendment would not be germane to this bill, and therefore I do not intend to offer it. Of course, the main thrust of the committee amendment was to retain 15 percent of this land area as the Nation's Capital under full control of the Congress. I believe we will have an opportunity later on to consider any improvements or perfectations in the proposal that the gentleman from California has offered at this time.

One part of the bill or substitute offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], and the part that I think is of primary importance, is that it does provide for final congressional approval. It gives us 90 days to act on whether or not we approve or reject the charter which will be drawn up by the people of the District of Columbia. I had planned to offer an amendment requiring congressional approval, but some Members asked me not to offer the amendment because it was felt that 90 days would give the Congress ample time to act.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. I am very interested in what the gentleman is saying

about the retrocession proposition. I note that some of those who now propose the new approach are recent converts to it. I do not know whether one of the "four horsemen" for home rule is here, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON]. In the last Congress when our subcommittee had hearings on home rule, we had a retrocession proposal by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL], who at that time was a Member of the House, which proposal advocated retrocession. We had another proposal which recommended the same thing that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] and others are proposing now. But I think it is interesting to note that in the 88th Congress the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], on page 220 of the hearings, said about the Kyl retrocession bill that the bill has "possibility of giving the people in the District true home rule."

On page 265 of the hearings, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] had this to say:

As between the Kyl proposal and the Multer, personally I would support the Kyl proposal over the Multer proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes inasmuch as I took up his time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. The Multer bill at that time was the administration bill, which is almost identical to H.R. 4644.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. That is correct. Actually there may be a lot of other things in the proposal offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] that we might want to change or amend. But basically, it is a good bill. It is a sound proposal which as I said before has the full approval of the duly constituted Committee on the District of Columbia. After all, there is nothing wrong in compromising or agreeing to act in a spirit of compromise, particularly when it is a true bipartisan compromise.

Now there may be some charges made that this may cause a delay in giving a measure of home rule to the people who live within the District of Columbia. Well, my answer to that charge is, What is the hurry? Have we not done enough damage so far in this session that we had to bring up any more controversial legislation and confusion before this Congress adjourns? This is a very important, serious, and complicated matter. Why should we not hesitate a little bit and proceed a little more cautiously before we act on this very serious and important matter? What is wrong with letting the people of the Nation's Capital determine for themselves what type of so-called home rule they would like to have? This is what most cities and most communities have done, and it is

September 29, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

district supervisors may now look to the future with more confidence than ever before in seeking new tools in resource development.

There are and will be increasing opportunities for you to initiate projects on your own and join other groups in cooperative ventures. I know Sterlin Hurley, your association president, has sent Governor Faubus recommendations for soil conservation district participation in the proposed Ozark area regional program under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

Under this act, administered by the Department of Commerce, grants and loans may be available to districts for acquisition and/or conservation and development of land, water, and related resources for public works, public service, or development facility usage.

Also supplementary grants may be available to districts to assist people in meeting their share of costs in watershed protection projects.

Under the act, districts in designated areas may have the opportunity to accelerate the watershed program, soil surveys, technical assistance to individual landowners, and in other areas.

It is of paramount importance that you continue to seek new tools and new avenues to carry out resource development work. We are making definite progress. The advances in resource development during the past few years are notable because they have occurred in so short a space of time. But so much remains to be done.

You and I know that resource conservation and development qualifies as a top priority job under the most rigid set of standards that can be applied.

But for us to know this is not enough. Others must be made to know—and to understand—and to act.

One way to accomplish this is by bringing all conservation interests together. Only then will the term "conservation" have full meaning.

You can do much to bring this about. For 30 years now your voice has been heard—and it has had impact. Your challenge is to continue to make your voice heard—and your leadership felt.

I will do my part to help. Let us push forward together until we have built a firm foundation for permanent prosperity in all America.

(Mr. LEGGETT (at the request of Mr. JENNINGS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. LEGGETT'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. SMITH of Virginia (at the request of Mr. JENNINGS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SMITH of Virginia's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CELLER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1101)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Na-

tionality Act, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175; 8 U.S.C. 1151) be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 201. (a) Exclusive of special immigrants defined in section 101(a)(27), and of the immediate relatives of United States citizens specified in subsection (b) of this section, the number of aliens who may be issued immigrant visas or who may otherwise acquire the status of an alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, or who may, pursuant to section 203(a)(7) enter conditionally, (1) shall not in any of the first three quarters of any fiscal year exceed a total of 45,000 and (11) shall not in any fiscal year exceed a total of 170,000.

"(b) The "immediate relatives" referred to in subsection (a) of this section shall mean the children, spouses, and parents of a citizen of the United States: *Provided*, That in the case of parents, such citizen must be at least twenty-one years of age. The immediate relatives specified in this subsection who are otherwise qualified for admission as immigrants shall be admitted as such, without regard to the numerical limitations in this Act.

"(c) During the period from July 1, 1965, through June 30, 1968, the annual quota of any quota area shall be the same as that which existed for that area on June 30, 1965. The Secretary of State shall, not later than on the sixtieth day immediately following the date of enactment of this subsection and again on or before September 1, 1966, and September 1, 1967, determine and proclaim the amount of quota numbers which remain unused at the end of the fiscal year ending on June 30, 1965, June 30, 1966, and June 30, 1967, respectively, and are available for distribution pursuant to subsection (d) of this section.

"(d) Quota numbers not issued or otherwise used during the previous fiscal year, as determined in accordance with subsection (c) hereof, shall be transferred to an immigration pool. Allocation of numbers from the pool and from national quotas shall not together exceed in any fiscal year the numerical limitations in subsection (a) of this section. The immigration pool shall be made available to immigrants otherwise admissible under the provisions of this Act who are unable to obtain prompt issuance of a preference visa due to oversubscription of their quotas, or subquotas as determined by the Secretary of State. Visas and conditional entries shall be allocated from the immigration pool within the percentage limitations and in the order of priority specified in section 203 without regard to the quota to which the alien is chargeable.

"(e) The immigration pool and the quotas of quota areas shall terminate June 30, 1968. Thereafter immigrants admissible under the provisions of this Act who are subject to the numerical limitations of subsection (a) of this section shall be admitted in accordance with the percentage limitations and in the order of priority specified in section 203."

"SEC. 2. Section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175; 8 U.S.C. 1152) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) No person shall receive any preference or priority or be discriminated against in the issuance of an immigrant visa because of his race, sex, nationality, place of birth, or place of residence, except as specifically provided in section 101(a)(27), sec-

tion 201(b), and section 203: *Provided*, That the total number of immigrant visas and the number of conditional entries made available to natives of any single foreign state under paragraphs (1) through (8) of section 203(a) shall not exceed 20,000 in any fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not operate to reduce the number of immigrants who may be admitted under the quota of any quota area before June 30, 1968.

"(b) Each independent country, self-governing dominion, mandated territory, and territory under the international trusteeship system of the United Nations, other than the United States and its outlying possessions shall be treated as a separate foreign state for the purposes of the numerical limitation set forth in the proviso to subsection (a) of this section when approved by the Secretary of State. All other inhabited lands shall be attributed to a foreign state specified by the Secretary of State. For the purposes of this Act the foreign state to which an immigrant is chargeable shall be determined by birth within such foreign state except that (1) an alien child, when accompanied by his alien parent or parents, may be charged to the same foreign state as the accompanying parent or of either accompanying parent if such parent has received or would be qualified for an immigrant visa, if necessary to prevent the separation of the child from the accompanying parent or parents, and if the foreign state to which such parent has been or would be chargeable has not exceeded the numerical limitation set forth in the proviso to subsection (a) of this section for that fiscal year; (2) if an alien is chargeable to a different foreign state from that of his accompanying spouse, the foreign state to which such alien is chargeable may, if necessary to prevent the separation of husband and wife, be determined by the foreign state of the accompanying spouse, if such spouse has received or would be qualified for an immigrant visa and if the foreign state to which such spouse has been or would be chargeable has not exceeded the numerical limitation set forth in the proviso to subsection (a) of this section for that fiscal year; (3) an alien born in the United States shall be considered as having been born in the country of which he is a citizen or subject, or if he is not a citizen or subject of any country then in the last foreign country in which he had his residence as determined by the consular officer; (4) an alien born within any foreign state in which neither of his parents was born and in which neither of his parents had a residence at the time of such alien's birth may be charged to the foreign state of either parent.

"(c) Any immigrant born in a colony or other component or dependent area of a foreign state unless a special immigrant as provided in section 101(a)(27) or an immediate relative of a United States citizen as specified in section 201(b), shall be chargeable, for the purpose of limitation set forth in section 202(a), to the foreign state, except that the number of persons born in any such colony or other component or dependent area overseas from the foreign state chargeable to the foreign state in any one fiscal year shall not exceed 1 per centum of the maximum number of immigrant visas available to such foreign state.

"(d) In the case of any change in the territorial limits of foreign states, the Secretary of State shall, upon recognition of such change, issue appropriate instructions to all diplomatic and consular offices."

"SEC. 3. Section 203 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175; 8 U.S.C. 1153) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 203. (a) Aliens who are subject to the numerical limitations specified in section 201(a) shall be allotted visas or their conditional entry authorized, as the case may be, as follows:

"(1) Visas shall be first made available, in a number not to exceed 20 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a)(1), to qualified immigrants who are the unmarried sons or daughters of citizens of the United States.

"(2) Visas shall next be made available, in a number not to exceed 20 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a)(1), plus any visas not required for the classes specified in paragraph (1), to qualified immigrants who are the spouses, unmarried sons or unmarried daughters of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

"(3) Visas shall next be made available, in a number not to exceed 10 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a)(1), to qualified immigrants who are members of the professions, or who because of their exceptional ability in the sciences or the arts will substantially benefit prospectively the national economy, cultural interests, or welfare of the United States.

"(4) Visas shall next be made available, in a number not to exceed 10 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a)(1), plus any visas not required for the classes specified in paragraphs (1) through (3), to qualified immigrants who are the married sons or the married daughters of citizens of the United States.

"(5) Visas shall next be made available, in a number not to exceed 24 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a)(1), plus any visas not required for the classes specified in paragraphs (1) through (4), to qualified immigrants who are the brothers or sisters of citizens of the United States.

"(6) Visas shall next be made available, in a number not to exceed 10 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a)(1), to qualified immigrants who are capable of performing specified skilled or unskilled labor, not of a temporary or seasonal nature, for which a shortage of employable and willing persons exists in the United States.

"(7) Conditional entries shall next be made available by the Attorney General, pursuant to such regulations as he may prescribe and in a number not to exceed 6 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a)(1), to aliens who satisfy an Immigration and Naturalization Service officer at an examination in any non-Communist or non-Communist-dominated country, (A) that (1) because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion they have fled (I) from any Communist or Communist-dominated country or area, or (II) from any country within the general area of the Middle East, and (II) are unable or unwilling to return to such country or area on account of race, religion, or political opinion, and (III) are not nationals of the countries or areas in which their application for conditional entry is made; or (B) that they are persons uprooted by catastrophic natural calamity as defined by the President who are unable to return to their usual place of abode. For the purpose of the foregoing the term "general area of the Middle East" means the area between and including (1) Libya on the west, (2) Turkey on the north, (3) Pakistan on the east, and (4) Saudi Arabia and Ethiopia on the south: *Provided*, That immigrant visas in a number not exceeding one-half the number specified in this paragraph may be made available, in lieu of conditional entries of a like number, to such aliens who have been continuously physically present in the United States for a period of at least two years prior to application for adjustment of status.

"(8) Visas authorized in any fiscal year, less those required for issuance to the classes specified in paragraphs (1) through (6) and less the number of conditional entries and visas made available pursuant to paragraph (7), shall be made available to other qualified immigrants strictly in the chronological

order in which they qualify. Waiting lists of applicants shall be maintained in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State. No immigrant visa shall be issued to a nonpreference immigrant under this paragraph, or to an immigrant with a preference under paragraph (3) or (6) of this subsection, until the consular officer is in receipt of a determination made by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a)(14).

"(9) A spouse or child as defined in section 101(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), or (E) shall, if not otherwise entitled to an immigrant status and the immediate issuance of a visa or to conditional entry under paragraphs (1) through (8), be entitled to the same status, and the same order of consideration provided in subsection (b), if accompanying, or following to join, his spouse or parent.

"(b) In considering applications for immigrant visas under subsection (a) consideration shall be given to applicants in the order in which the classes of which they are members are listed in subsection (a).

"(c) Immigrant visas issued pursuant to paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (a) shall be issued to eligible immigrants in the order in which a petition in behalf of each such immigrant is filed with the Attorney General as provided in section 204.

"(d) Every immigrant shall be presumed to be a nonpreference immigrant until he establishes to the satisfaction of the consular officer and the immigration officer that he is entitled to a preference status under paragraphs (1) through (7) of subsection (a), or to a special immigrant status under section 101(a)(27), or that he is an immediate relative of a United States citizen as specified in section 201(b). In the case of any alien claiming in his application for an immigrant visa to be an immediate relative of a United States citizen as specified in section 201(b) or to be entitled to preference immigrant status under paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (a), the consular officer shall not grant such status until he has been authorized to do so as provided by section 204.

"(e) For the purposes of carrying out his responsibilities in the orderly administration of this section, the Secretary of State is authorized to make reasonable estimates of the anticipated numbers of visas to be issued during any quarter of any fiscal year within each of the categories of subsection (a), and to rely upon such estimates in authorizing the issuance of such visas. The Secretary of State, in his discretion, may terminate the registration on a waiting list of any alien who fails to evidence his continued intention to apply for a visa in such manner as may be by regulation prescribed.

"(f) The Attorney General shall submit to the Congress a report containing complete and detailed statement of facts in the case of each alien who conditionally entered the United States pursuant to subsection (a)(7) of this section. Such reports shall be submitted on or before January 15 and June 15 of each year.

"(g) Any alien who conditionally entered the United States as a refugee, pursuant to subsection (a)(7) of this section, whose conditional entry has not been terminated by the Attorney General pursuant to such regulations as he may prescribe, who has been in the United States for at least two years, and who has not acquired permanent residence, shall forthwith return or be returned to the custody of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and shall thereupon be inspected and examined for admission into the United States, and his case dealt with in accordance with the provisions of sections 235, 236, and 237 of this Act.

"(h) Any alien who, pursuant to subsection (g) of this section, is found, upon inspection by the immigration officer or after

hearing before a special inquiry officer, to be admissible as an immigrant under this Act at the time of his inspection and examination, except for the fact that he was not and is not in possession of the documents required by section 212(a)(20), shall be regarded as lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his arrival.

"Sec. 4. Section 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 176; 8 U.S.C. 1154) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 204. (a) Any citizen of the United States claiming that an alien is entitled to a preference status by reason of the relationships described in paragraphs (1), (4), or (5) of section 203(a), or to an immediate relative status under section 201(b), or any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence claiming that an alien is entitled to a preference status by reason of the relationship described in section 203(a)(2), or any alien desiring to be classified as a preference immigrant under section 203(a)(3) (or any person on behalf of such an alien), or any person desiring and intending to employ within the United States an alien entitled to classification as a preference immigrant under section 203(a)(6), may file a petition with the Attorney General for such classification. The petition shall be in such form as the Attorney General may by regulations prescribe and shall contain such information and be supported by such documentary evidence as the Attorney General may require. The petition shall be made under oath administered by any individual having authority to administer oaths, if executed in the United States, but, if executed outside the United States, administered by a consular officer or an immigration officer.

"(b) After an investigation of the facts in each case, and after consultation with the Secretary of Labor with respect to petitions to accord a status under section 203(a)(3) or (6), the Attorney General shall, if he determines that the facts stated in the petition are true and that the alien in behalf of whom the petition is made is an immediate relative specified in section 201(b) or is eligible for a preference status under section 203(a), approve the petition and forward one copy thereof to the Department of State. The Secretary of State shall then authorize the consular officer concerned to grant the preference status.

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b) no more than two petitions may be approved for one petitioner in behalf of a child as defined in section 101(b)(1)(E) or (F) unless necessary to prevent the separation of brothers and sisters and no petition shall be approved if the alien has previously been accorded a nonquota or preference status as the spouse of a citizen of the United States or the spouse of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, by reason of a marriage determined by the Attorney General to have been entered into for the purpose of evading the immigration laws.

"(d) The Attorney General shall forward to the Congress a report on each approved petition for immigrant status under sections 203(a)(3) or 203(a)(6) stating the basis for his approval and such facts as were by him deemed to be pertinent in establishing the beneficiary's qualifications for the preferential status. Such reports shall be submitted to the Congress on the first and fifteenth day of each calendar month in which the Congress is in session.

"(e) Nothing in this section shall be construed to entitle an immigrant, in behalf of whom a petition under this section is approved, to enter the United States as a preference immigrant under section 203(a) or as an immediate relative under section 201(b) if upon his arrival at a port of entry in the United States he is found not to be entitled to such classification."

September 29, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

24549

"Sec. 5. Section 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 176; 8 U.S.C. 1155) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 205. The Attorney General may, at any time, for what he deems to be good and sufficient cause, revoke the approval of any petition approved by him under section 204. Such revocation shall be effective as of the date of approval of any such petition. In no case, however, shall such revocation have effect unless there is mailed to the petitioner's last known address a notice of the revocation and unless notice of the revocation is communicated through the Secretary of State to the beneficiary of the petition before such beneficiary commences his journey to the United States. If notice of revocation is not so given, and the beneficiary applies for admission to the United States, his admissibility shall be determined in the manner provided for by sections 235 and 236."

"Sec. 6. Section 206 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 181; 8 U.S.C. 1156) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 206. If an immigrant having an immigrant visa is excluded from admission to the United States and deported, or does not apply for admission before the expiration of the validity of his visa, or if an alien having an immigrant visa issued to him as a preference immigrant is found not to be a preference immigrant, an immigrant visa or a preference immigrant visa, as the case may be, may be issued in lieu thereof to another qualified alien."

"Sec. 7. Section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 181; 8 U.S.C. 1157) is stricken."

"Sec. 8. Section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 166; 8 U.S.C. 1101) is amended as follows:

"(a) Paragraph (27) of subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(27) The term 'special immigrant' means—

"(A) an immigrant who was born in any independent foreign country of the Western Hemisphere or in the Canal Zone and the spouse and children of any such immigrant, if accompanying, or following to join him: *Provided*, That no immigrant visa shall be issued pursuant to this clause until the consular officer is in receipt of a determination made by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a) (14);

"(B) an immigrant, lawfully admitted for permanent residence, who is returning from a temporary visit abroad;

"(C) an immigrant who was a citizen of the United States and may, under section 824(a) or 327 of title III, apply for reacquisition of citizenship;

"(D) (1) an immigrant who continuously for at least two years immediately preceding the time of his application for admission to the United States has been, and who seeks to enter the United States solely for the purpose of carrying on the vocation of minister of a religious denomination, and whose services are needed by such religious denomination having a bona fide organization in the United States; and (2) the spouse or the child of any such immigrant, if accompanying or following to join him; or

"(E) an immigrant who is an employee, or an honorably retired former employee, of the United States Government abroad, and who has performed faithful service for a total of fifteen years, or more, and his accompanying spouse and children: *Provided*, That the principal officer of a Foreign Service establishment, in his discretion, shall have recommended the granting of special immigrant status to such alien in exceptional circumstances and the Secretary of State approves such recommendation and finds that it is in the national interest to grant such status."

"(b) Paragraph (32) of subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(32) The term 'profession' shall include but not be limited to architects, engineers, lawyers, physicians, surgeons, and teachers in elementary or secondary schools, colleges, academies, or seminaries."

"(c) Subparagraph (1)(F) of subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(F) a child, under the age of fourteen at the time a petition is filed in his behalf to accord a classification as an immediate relative under section 201(b), who is an orphan because of the death or disappearance of, abandonment or desertion by, or separation or loss from, both parents, or for whom the sole or surviving parent is incapable of providing the proper care which will be provided the child if admitted to the United States and who has in writing irrevocably released the child for emigration and adoption; who has been adopted abroad by a United States citizen and his spouse who personally saw and observed the child prior to or during the adoption proceedings; or who is coming to the United States for adoption by a United States citizen and spouse who have complied with the preadoption requirements, if any, of the child's proposed residence: *Provided*, That no natural parent or prior adoptive parent of any such child shall thereafter, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under this Act."

"Sec. 9. Section 211 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 181; 8 U.S.C. 1181) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 211. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) no immigrant shall be admitted into the United States unless at the time of application for admission he (1) has a valid unexpired immigrant visa or was born subsequent to the issuance of such visa of the accompanying parent, and (2) presents a valid unexpired passport or other suitable travel document, or document of identity and nationality, if such document is required under the regulations issued by the Attorney General. With respect to immigrants to be admitted under quotas of quota areas prior to June 30, 1968, no immigrant visa shall be deemed valid unless the immigrant is properly chargeable to the quota area under the quota of which the visa is issued."

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212(a) (20) of this Act in such cases or in such classes of cases and under such conditions as may be by regulations prescribed, returning resident immigrants, defined in section 101(a) (27) (B), who are otherwise admissible may be readmitted to the United States by the Attorney General in his discretion without being required to obtain a passport, immigrant visa, reentry permit or other documentation."

"Sec. 10. Section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 182; 8 U.S.C. 1182) is amended as follows:

"(a) Paragraph (14) is amended to read as follows:

"Aliens seeking to enter the United States, for the purpose of performing skilled or unskilled labor, unless the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified to the Secretary of State and to the Attorney General that (A) there are not sufficient workers in the United States who are able, willing, qualified, and available at the time of application for a visa and admission to the United States and at the place to which the alien is destined to perform such skilled or unskilled labor, and (B) the employment of such aliens will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of the workers in the United States similarly employed. The exclusion of aliens under this paragraph shall apply to special immigrants defined in section 101(a) (27) (A) (other than the parents, spouses, or children of United States citizens or of aliens lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence), to preference immigrant aliens described in section

203(a) (3) and (6), and to nonpreference immigrant aliens described in section 203(a) (8);"

"(b) Paragraph (20) is amended by deleting the letter '(e)' and substituting therefor the letter '(a)'."

"(c) Paragraph (21) is amended by deleting the word 'quota'."

"(d) Paragraph (24) is amended by deleting the language within the parentheses and substituting therefor the following: 'other than aliens described in section 101(a) (27) (A) and (B)'."

"Sec. 11. The Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175; 8 U.S.C. 1151) is amended as follows:

"(a) Section 221(a) is amended by deleting the words 'the particular nonquota category in which the immigrant is classified, if a nonquota immigrant,' and substituting in lieu thereof the words 'the preference, nonpreference, immediate relative, or special immigration classification to which the alien is charged.'"

"(b) The fourth sentence of subsection 221(c) is amended by deleting the word 'quota' preceding the word 'number,' the word 'quota' preceding the word 'year,' and the words 'a quota' preceding the word 'immigrant,' and substituting in lieu thereof the word 'an'."

"(c) Section 222(a) is amended by deleting the words 'preference quota or a nonquota immigrant' and substituting in lieu thereof the words 'an immediate relative within the meaning of section 201(b) or a preference or special immigrant'."

"(d) Section 224 is amended to read as follows: 'A consular officer may, subject to the limitations provided in section 221, issue an immigrant visa to a special immigrant or immediate relative as such upon satisfactory proof, under regulations prescribed under this Act, that the applicant is entitled to special immigrant or immediate relative status.'"

"(e) Section 241(a) (10) is amended by substituting for the words 'Section 101(a) (27) (C)' the words 'Section 101(a) (27) (A)'."

"(f) Section 243(h) is amended by striking out 'physical persecution' and inserting in lieu thereof 'persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion'."

"Sec. 12. Section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 214; 8 U.S.C. 1254) is amended as follows:

"(a) Subsection (d) is amended to read:

"(d) Upon the cancellation of deportation in the case of any alien under this section, the Attorney General shall record the alien's lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date the cancellation of deportation of such alien is made, and unless the alien is entitled to a special immigrant classification under section 101(a) (27) (A), or is an immediate relative within the meaning of section 201(b) the Secretary of State shall reduce by one the number of nonpreference immigrant visas authorized to be issued under section 203(a) (8) for the fiscal year then current."

"(b) Subsection (f) is amended by inserting after the language 'entered the United States as a crewman' the language 'subsequent to June 30, 1964.'"

"Sec. 13. Section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 217; 8 U.S.C. 1255) is amended as follows:

"(a) Subsection (b) is amended to read:

"(b) Upon the approval of an application for adjustment made under subsection (a), the Attorney General shall record the alien's lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date the order of the Attorney General approving the application for the adjustment of status is made, and the Secretary of State shall reduce by one the number of the preference or nonpreference visas authorized to be issued under section 203(a) within the class to which the alien is chargeable, for the fiscal year then current."

24550

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

September 29, 1965

"(b) Subsection (c) is amended to read:
 "(c) The provisions of this section shall not be applicable to any alien who is a native of any country of the Western Hemisphere or of any adjacent island named in section 101(b) (5)."

"Sec. 14. Section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 230; 8 U.S.C. 1351) is amended as follows:

"(a) Immediately after 'Sec. 281.' insert '(a)':

"(b). Paragraph (6) is amended to read as follows:

"(6) For filing with the Attorney General of each petition under section 204 and section 214(c), \$10; and";

"(c) The following is inserted after paragraph (7), and is designated subsection (b):

"(b) The time and manner of payment of the fees specified in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) of this section, including but not limited to partial deposit or prepayment at the time of registration, shall be prescribed by the Secretary of State; and

"(d) The paragraph beginning with the words 'The fees * * *' is designated subsection (c)."

"Sec. 15. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 182; 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(1)) is amended by deleting the language 'feeble-minded' and inserting the language 'mentally retarded' in its place.

"(b) Paragraph (4) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 182; 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(4)) is amended by deleting the word 'epilepsy' and substituting the words 'or sexual deviation'.

"(c) Sections 212 (f), (g), and (h) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by the Act of September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 654, 655; 8 U.S.C. 1182), are hereby redesignated sections 212 (g), (h), and (i), respectively, and section 212 (g) as so redesignated is amended by inserting before the words 'afflicted with tuberculosis in any form' the following: 'who is excludable from the United States under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section, or any alien' and by adding at the end of such subsection the following sentence: 'Any alien excludable under paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of this section because of past history of mental illness who has one of the same family relationships as are prescribed in this subsection for aliens afflicted with tuberculosis and whom the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service finds to have been free of such mental illness for a period of time sufficient in the light of such history to demonstrate recovery shall be eligible for a visa in accordance with the terms of this subsection.'

"Sec. 16. Sections 1, 2, and 11 of the Act of July 14, 1950 (74 Stat. 504-505), as amended by section 6 of the Act of June 28, 1962 (76 Stat. 124), are repealed.

"Sec. 17. Section 221(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 192; 8 U.S.C. 1201(g)) is amended by deleting the period at the end thereof and adding the following: 'Provided further, That a visa may be issued to an alien defined in section 101(a) (15) (B) or (F), if such alien is otherwise entitled to receive a visa, upon receipt of a notice by the consular officer from the Attorney General of the giving of a bond with sufficient surety in such sum and containing such conditions as the consular officer shall prescribe, to insure that at the expiration of the time for which such alien has been admitted by the Attorney General, as provided in section 214(a), or upon failure to maintain the status under which he was admitted, or to maintain any status subsequently acquired under section 248 of the Act, such alien will depart from the United States.'

"Sec. 18. So much of section 272(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 226; 8 U.S.C. 1322(a)) as precedes the words

'shall pay to the collector of customs' is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 272. (a) Any person who shall bring to the United States an alien (other than an alien crewman) who is (1) mentally retarded, (2) insane, (3) afflicted with psychopathic personality, or with sexual deviation, (4) a chronic alcoholic, (5) afflicted with any dangerous contagious disease, or (6) a narcotic drug addict."

"Sec. 19. Section 249 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 219; 8 U.S.C. 1259) is amended by striking out 'June 28, 1940' in clause (a) of such section and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1948.'

"Sec. 20. This Act shall become effective on the first day of the first month after the expiration of thirty days following the date of its enactment except as provided herein.

"Sec. 21. (a) There is hereby established a Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration (hereinafter referred to as the 'Commission') to be composed of fifteen members. The President shall appoint the Chairman of the Commission and four other members thereof. The President of the Senate, with the approval of the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, shall appoint five members from the membership of the Senate. The Speaker of the House of Representatives, with the approval of the majority and minority leaders of the House, shall appoint five members from the membership of the House. Not more than three members appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, shall be members of the same political party. A vacancy in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original designation and appointment.

"(b) The Commission shall study the following matters:

"(1) Prevailing and projected demographic, technological, and economic trends, particularly as they pertain to Western Hemisphere nations;

"(2) Present and projected unemployment in the United States, by occupations, industries, geographic areas and other factors, in relation to immigration from the Western Hemisphere;

"(3) The interrelationships between immigration, present and future, and existing and contemplated national and international programs and projects of Western Hemisphere nations, including programs and projects for economic and social development;

"(4) The operation of the immigration laws of the United States as they pertain to Western Hemisphere nations, including the adjustment of status for Cuban refugees, with emphasis on the adequacy of such laws from the standpoint of fairness and from the standpoint of the impact of such laws on employment and working conditions within the United States;

"(5) The implications of the foregoing with respect to the security and international relations of Western Hemisphere nations; and

"(6) Any other matters which the Commission believes to be germane to the purposes for which it was established.

"(c) On or before July 1, 1967, the Commission shall make a first report to the President and the Congress, and on or before January 15, 1968, the Commission shall make a final report to the President and the Congress. Such reports shall include the recommendations of the Commission as to what changes, if any, are needed in the immigration laws in the light of its study. The Commission's recommendations shall include, but shall not be limited to, recommendations as to whether, and if so how, numerical limitations should be imposed upon immigration to the United States from the nations of the Western Hemisphere. In formulating its recommendations on the

latter subject, the Commission shall give particular attention to the impact of such immigration on employment and working conditions within the United States and to the necessity of preserving the special relationship of the United States with its sister Republics of the Western Hemisphere.

"(d) The life of the Commission shall expire upon the filing of its final report, except that the Commission may continue to function for up to sixty days thereafter for the purpose of winding up its affairs.

"(e) Unless legislation inconsistent herewith is enacted on or before June 30, 1968, in response to recommendations of the Commission or otherwise, the number of special immigrants within the meaning of section 101(a) (27) (A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, exclusive of special immigrants who are immediate relatives of United States citizens as described in section 201(b) of that Act, shall not, in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1968, or in any fiscal year thereafter, exceed a total of 120,000.

"(f) All Federal agencies shall cooperate fully with the Commission to the end that it may effectively carry out its duties.

"(g) Each member of the Commission who is not otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall receive the sum of \$100 for each day spent in the work of the Commission, shall be paid actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses, when away from his usual place of residence, in accordance with section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended. Each member of the Commission who is otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for such other service, but while engaged in the work of the Commission shall be paid actual travel expenses, when away from his usual place of residence, in accordance with the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended.

"(h) There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

"Sec. 22 (a). The designation of chapter 1, title II, is amended to read as follows: 'CHAPTER 1—SELECTION SYSTEM'.

"(b) The title preceding section 201 is amended to read as follows: 'NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS'.

"(c) The title preceding section 202 is amended to read as follows: 'NUMERICAL LIMITATION TO ANY SINGLE FOREIGN STATE'.

"(d) The title preceding section 203 is amended to read as follows: 'ALLOCATION OF IMMIGRANT VISAS'.

"(e) The title preceding section 204 is amended to read as follows: 'PROCEDURE FOR GRANTING IMMIGRANT STATUS'.

"(f) The title preceding section 205 is amended to read as follows: 'REVOCATION OF APPROVAL OF PETITIONS'.

"(g) The title preceding section 206 is amended to read as follows: 'UNUSED IMMIGRANT VISAS'.

"(h) The title preceding section 207 is repealed.

"(i) The title preceding section 224 of chapter 3, title II, is amended to read as follows: 'IMMEDIATE RELATIVE AND SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISAS'.

"(j) The title preceding section 249 is amended to read as follows: 'RECORD OF ADMISSION FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE IN THE CASE OF CERTAIN ALIENS WHO ENTERED THE UNITED STATES PRIOR TO JULY 1, 1924, OR JUNE 30, 1948.'

"Sec. 23. (a) The table of contents (Title II—Immigration, chapter 1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, is amended to read as follows:

September 29, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

24551

CHAPTER 1—SELECTION SYSTEM

- "Sec. 201. Numerical limitations.
- "Sec. 202. Numerical limitation to any single foreign state.
- "Sec. 203. Allocation of immigrant visas.
- "Sec. 204. Procedure for granting immigrant status.
- "Sec. 205. Revocation of approval of petitions.
- "Sec. 206. Unused immigrant visas."

"(b) The table of contents (Title II—Immigration, chapter 3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, is amended by changing the designation of section 224 to read as follows:

"Sec. 224. Immediate relative and special immigrant visas."

"(c) The table of contents (Title II—Immigration, chapter 5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by changing the designation of section 249 to read as follows:

"Sec. 249. Record of admission for permanent residence in the case of certain aliens who entered the United States prior to July 1, 1924, or June 30, 1948."

"Sec. 24. Paragraph (6) of section 101(b) is repealed."

And the Senate agree to the same.

EMANUEL CELLER,
MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
FRANK CHELF,
PETER W. RODINO, JR.,
HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
JACK B. BROOKS,
WILLIAM M. MCCULLOUGH,
ARCH A. MOORE, JR.,
WILLIAM T. CAHILL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

SAMUEL J. ERVIN, JR.,
EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
PHILIP A. HART,
EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN,
HIRAM FONG,
JACOB K. JAVITS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill H.R. 2580 to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House passed H.R. 2580 and the Senate then substituted the provisions it had adopted by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting its own provision. The Senate insisted upon its version and requested a conference; the House then agreed to the conference. The conference report recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the House version and agree to the same with an amendment, the amendment being to insert in lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment the matter agreed to by the conferees, and that the Senate agree thereto. The conference report contains substantially the language of the House version with certain exceptions which are explained below.

(1) As passed by the House the bill provided in section 203(a) (7) that not more than 10,200 refugees from communism and from the general area of the Middle East may be granted conditional entries each year. As amended by the Senate, the definition of refugees was enlarged to include aliens who have been uprooted from their usual place of abode by a catastrophic natural calamity. The conferees agreed to adopt the Senate provision.

(2) The conferees have agreed to provide in section 4 of the bill that immigration officers as well as consular officers may ad-

minister oaths executed outside of the United States. This section conforms with existing law.

(3) The House bill contained in section 11 a provision requiring the President to report to the Congress in the event the number of immigrants admitted from the Western Hemisphere exceeded in any one fiscal year by 10 per centum or more the average number admitted in the previous 5 fiscal years. The Senate amendment contained no such provision. In order to conform to a new section 21 which provides for the establishment of a Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration the conferees agreed to the deletion of the House provision.

(4) The Senate amendment provided that the Attorney General, in his discretion, could suspend deportation of alien crewmen and adjust their status to that of lawful permanent residents under the procedure provided in section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The House bill contained no such provision. The conferees agreed to the Senate version with an amendment precluding such suspension of deportation for those alien crewmen who entered subsequent to June 30, 1964.

(5) The House bill provided in section 13 that natives of any countries of the Western Hemisphere or of an adjacent island shall be ineligible for adjustment of status under the provisions of section 245. The Senate amendment exempted from this provision aliens born in an independent country of the Western Hemisphere who, because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion or political opinion, is out of his usual place of abode and unable to return thereto. The conferees agreed to accept the House provision.

(6) Section 15 of the House bill provided for a discretionary waiver of exclusion based upon mental retardation for children under the age of 14 when accompanying their United States citizen or permanent resident alien parents into the United States. The Senate version provides a discretionary waiver for any person excludable because of mental retardation who is a relative as defined in the redesignated section 212(g). The conference report adopts the Senate version.

(7) The conferees agreed to adopt the House version of section 17 and agreed to delete the Senate amendment thereto which provided that an alien student must submit evidence that he will be admitted and regularly enrolled as a student at an approved educational institution. Such requirement is substantially in existing law.

(8) Section 19 of the Senate amendment has no equivalent in the House bill. The Senate amendment extended the benefits of section 249 to permit the creation of a record of lawful admission to aliens who entered the United States prior to June 28, 1958. The conferees agreed to adjust the date provided in the Senate amendment to June 30, 1948.

9. Section 21 of the Senate amendment has no equivalent in the House bill. The conferees have adopted this provision which establishes a conditional limitation of 120,000 upon the Western Hemisphere and establishes a Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration composed of fifteen members with an amendment to provide that five members thereto be appointed respectively by the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with the stipulation that not more than three of the members appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, respectively, shall be members of the same political party. The conferees added to the matters to be studied by the Select Commission specific reference to the matter of adjust-

ment of status of Cuban refugees in the United States.

EMANUEL CELLER,
MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
FRANK CHELF,
PETER W. RODINO, JR.,
HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
JACK B. BROOKS,
WILLIAM M. MCCULLOUGH,
ARCH A. MOORE, JR.,
WILLIAM T. CAHILL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MORRIS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for September 29 and 30, on account of official business.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa, for October 1, on account of official business.

Mr. REDLIN, for October 1, on account of official business.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa, for September 30 and October 1, on account of official business.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska, for September 29 through October 5, 1965, on account of National Parks Subcommittee field hearings.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. KASTENMEIER (at the request of Mr. JENNINGS), for 60 minutes, on September 30, 1965; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. EVERETT in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. EDMONDSON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEL CLAWSON), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho in five instances.

Mr. MICHEL in two instances.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan.

Mr. BOB WILSON in two instances.

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

Mrs. BOLTON.

Mr. CLEVELAND.

Mr. RUMSFELD in two instances.

Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JENNINGS), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CAREY in eight instances.

Mr. DOW in two instances.

Mr. FALLON.

Mrs. SULLIVAN in two instances.

Mr. RYAN in two instances.

24552

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

September 29, 1965

Mr. PEPPER.
Mr. STEPHENS.
Mr. EDWARDS of California.
Mr. SENNER.
Mr. TODD in two instances.
Mr. DULSKI in two instances.
Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.
Mr. HANSEN of Iowa in two instances.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1065. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire through exchange the Great Falls property in the State of Virginia for administration in connection with the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and for other purposes;

S. 1786. An act to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and quasi-public agencies and corporations not operated for profit with respect to water supply, water systems, and waste disposal systems serving rural areas and to make grants to aid in rural community development planning and in connection with the construction of such community facilities, to increase the annual aggregate of insured loans thereunder, and for other purposes; and

S. 1620. An act to consolidate the two judicial districts in the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 205. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 38 of the United States Code in order to increase the educational assistance allowances payable under the war orphans' educational assistance program, and for other purposes;

H.R. 728. An act to amend section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936;

H.R. 1274. An act for the relief of Mrs. Michiko Miyazaki Williams; and

H.J. Res. 673. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 30, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1628. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1966 (H. Doc. 295), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1582. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the State of California; with amendment (Rept. No. 1098). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KING of California: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 8210. A bill to amend the International Organizations Immunities Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1099). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 11029. A bill relating to the tariff treatment of certain woven fabrics of vegetable fibers (except cotton); with amendment (Rept. No. 1100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee of Conference. H.R. 2580. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1101). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and separately referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 11319. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 11320. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 11321. A bill to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 11322. A bill to provide a program of Federal assistance to elementary schools throughout the Nation to improve educational opportunities through provisions for the services of child development specialists and to provide a program of Federal assistance for the training of such elementary school personnel in the institutions of higher education, and for other educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 11323. A bill to provide salary incentives for teachers who choose to teach children in elementary and secondary schools in school districts having high concentration of low-income families; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 11324. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 11325. A bill to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on certain un-

wrought copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 11326. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove certain limitations on the amount of the deduction for contributions to the pension and profit-sharing plans made on behalf of self-employed individuals and to change the definition of "earned income" applicable with respect to such plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H.R. 11327. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide that certain social security benefits may be waived and not counted as income under that section; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 11328. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Alcoholism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11329. A bill to provide for the designation of the ship *Constellation* as a national historic shrine and as the first ship of the Navy; and to provide further that the flag of the United States of America may be flown for 24 hours of each day over the *Constellation*; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 11330. A bill to prohibit the transportation or shipment in interstate commerce of master keys to persons prohibited by State law from receiving or possessing them; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11331. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the education of a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11332. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for certain expenses of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 11333. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 11334. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the memory of the late general of the Army, Douglas MacArthur; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 11335. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11336. A bill to strengthen the criminal penalties for the mailing, importing, or transporting of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 11337. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove certain limitations on the amount of the deduction for contributions to pension and profit-sharing plans made on behalf of self-employed individuals and to change the definition of "earned income" applicable with respect to such plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 11338. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1588. I congratulate President Johnson for taking up the matter with such imagination and vigor.

Now that final enactment appears imminent, I only wish to express the hope that the appropriations committees will see the wisdom of funding the authorized programs fully, and that the Department of Commerce then will proceed as swiftly as possible to implement them. Especially in New England, where we are faced with some hard decisions about public support for the continuance of rail passenger service, the demonstration projects provided in S. 1588 will be most helpful in guiding future policy.

Finally, I would like to express my deep appreciation to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] who as chairman of the Commerce Committee introduced S. 1588, and to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHEL] who as chairman of the Transportation Subcommittee guided the measure with a sure hand. I extend my fullest thanks to my senior colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] who joined me in cosponsoring the legislation and then worked hard for its passage, and finally, thanks are due to Members of the House, particularly Congressman HARRIS and Congressman STAGGERS who did much to insure approval of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Subsequently the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1588) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research, development, and demonstrations in high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes, which was, to amend the title, so as to read: "An Act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes."

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the title of the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Bill filed

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. FONG. Madam President, our Declaration of Independence proclaims that all men are created equal. But in many areas of American life we have not practiced this principal tenet of our democracy.

Less than a year ago, Congress enacted the historic Civil Rights Act of 1964, designed to eliminate some of the more

blatant forms of racial discrimination against our own citizens. Again, in this 1st session of the 89th Congress, legislation has been enacted to extend, once and for all, the franchise of all eligible American citizens.

As we reappraise the relationship of citizen to citizen under these measures, it is well for us to reexamine this same relationship—man's equality to man—with respect to peoples of the world. Elimination of racial barriers against citizens of other lands is a logical extension of eliminating discrimination against American citizens.

Madam President, repeatedly and for many years, I have spoken in the Senate to urge consideration of legislation to reform our immigration laws in this way. Again and again I have urged that the Congress enact an immigration measure to eliminate the last vestiges of racial discrimination from our immigration laws.

Now, at last, we have before us an immigration proposal, H.R. 2580, which reflects in every detail the principles of equality and human dignity to which our Nation subscribes, and which, at the same time, serves the national interest.

NECESSITY FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM

This is an issue of fundamental national policy, because the racial restrictions inherent in our present immigration laws disparage our democratic heritage. They directly contradict the spirit and principles of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and our traditional standards of fairness and justice.

Racial immigration restrictions began in 1875 and reached their peak in 1924. Public sentiment in 1924 was summarized by Senator David A. Reed, who said:

I think most of us are reconciled to the idea of discrimination. I think the American people want us to discriminate; and I do not think discrimination in itself is unfair. We have got to discriminate. The only question that I think worries the committee is (which method) is the more plausible method of attaining that discrimination. Practically all of us are agreed that (racial discrimination) is an end that should be attained.

That is what Senator David A. Reed said.

However, since 1924, we have made tremendous progress toward removing racial restrictions in our immigration policies and practices. An outstanding milestone was the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. It was a far-reaching step forward in the relaxation of the racial curbs in our immigration statutes. It wiped out total exclusion against Japan and other Asian nations and for the first time allowed many nations a long-denied quota of immigrants.

Progressive as that 1952 law was, today it is very obsolete. More than 10 years have now passed since its enact-

ment. Since then, our Nation and the world have witnessed revolutionary changes in almost every phase of life. Many areas emerged from colonial status to full nationhood. Many nations have changed their form of government. There is greater clamor for freedom, liberty, and justice, and, worldwide, peoples are on the march seeking equality. Economic, interdependence has shaken traditional economic, social, and political patterns.

At home, we have wiped out racial barriers in our Armed Forces, in interstate transportation, in our institutions of higher learning, and in many areas of our economy. We are making significant progress in desegregating our public schools, housing, business, and public accommodations, and protecting the voting rights of all citizens. It is imperative that we, as a Nation, recognize this great upheaval in our Nation and throughout the world for equal status.

Repeatedly America has been accused that it has been unfair in its immigration laws. We have erected racial barriers that deny equal dignity and respect to more than one-half of the world's population. These racial barriers are bad for America. They hurt America's image as the leader of the free world.

For example, do Senators know that under present American immigration quotas for Asia and the Pacific areas more than 50 percent of the people who populate our newest State could be almost totally excluded from the United States?

That Ireland, with a population of 2,815,000 has a larger quota than all Asia, with a population of nearly one and a half billion?

That the quota for tiny Switzerland is greater than the quotas for the entire African continent?

That Rumania—a Communist nation—has a quota of 289, which is small enough, but this is nearly a third more than our quota for non-Communist India and the non-Communist Philippines combined?

Do Senators know that the immigration quotas of nearly every nation in the Asia-Pacific area are so small that they are heavily oversubscribed, according to latest State Department figures?

Japan's waiting list stretches all the way to 1989 or beyond; the quota for Chinese persons is for all practical purposes exhausted in perpetuity, because immigrants already admitted into the United States have been charged against it; the quota for Okinawa, which does not fall under Japan's but under a special Asia-Pacific quota of 100 shared by 18 other Pacific dependencies, is backlogged for 48 years, until the year 2011; the Philippines quota is 89 years behind, and only the quotas of Afghanistan, Cambodia, Malaya, Laos, and Nepal are open,

since these are countries which generally have not sought immigration beyond their borders.

THE ORIENTAL EXCLUSION ACTS

The racial strictures of the present immigration laws have their genesis in the 19th century, when more than 19 million immigrants arrived in this country. The first restrictive law passed by Congress was the act of March 3, 1875, which empowered consular officials to investigate Chinese and Japanese immigrant labor contracts for evidences of any lewd or immoral purposes. It establishes penalties for U.S. citizens who transported subjects of China or Japan without free consent for a term of service and rendered such contracts void. Immigration officers were required to inspect all vessels and certify their compliance.

Because of the tremendous influx of Chinese immigrants—200,000 from 1850 to 1880—following the discovery of gold in California, Congress enacted the first of the Chinese Exclusion Acts of 1882. The act suspended immigration of Chinese laborers to the United States for 10 years, although Chinese already in the country on November 17, 1880, were allowed to leave and reenter.

Two years later, the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 was tightened even further. Not only was the period of suspension of Chinese immigration extended another 10 years in the act of 1884; the stricture was made applicable to all Chinese, wherever their birth or whatever their national allegiance.

While the Chinese Exclusion Act of March 12, 1888, allowed entry of Chinese officials, teachers, students, merchants, and travelers for pleasure or curiosity, the legislation of October 1, 1888, took away from Chinese laborers the right of reentry into the United States, unless they had reentered before the date of the act.

These exclusion laws were extended again in 1892 and in 1902; in 1904 they were extended without limitation.

Partly because immigrants continued to pour into the United States—some fourteen and a half million between 1900 and 1920—and partly because of a sharp rise in Japanese immigration during that period, there arose in Congress insistent demands for Japanese restriction. The Japanese Government protested vigorously. President Theodore Roosevelt, who was not in sympathy with Japanese restriction, pressed for passage of an act allowing Japanese to become naturalized citizens. Nevertheless, Congress in 1907 passed an immigration act authorizing the President to negotiate international agreements regulating immigration. As required by law, President Roosevelt signed a gentlemen's agreement with Japan in 1907, limiting the volume of Japanese immigration to the United States.

Then, based on the 1907 law, the President later that year issued a proclamation excluding from the United States Japanese or Korean laborers, skilled or unskilled, who have received passports to go to Mexico, Canada, or Hawaii and come therefrom.

Seventeen years later, the House Committee on Immigration, reporting on the quota law of 1924, pointed out that the real intent of the gentlemen's agreement was to restrict Japanese immigration and thus check any further "growth of U.S. Japanese population, which was considered unassimilable and ineligible for citizenship.

Under the gentlemen's agreement, between 1907 and 1924 more than 53,000 Japanese immigrants were brought to Hawaii to work on the pineapple and sugar plantations. Total immigration of Japanese to Hawaii up to that time was 180,000.

With passage of the Immigration Act of 1924, all Japanese immigrants as well as other persons of Oriental descent were barred. In desperate need of cheap labor, Hawaiian planters turned to the Philippines, until 1946 an American possession, as an alternative source of labor supply. Between 1910 and 1932, more than 100,000 Filipinos arrived in Hawaii. This represented the last large wave of Oriental migration to the United States.

Opposition to free immigration gained momentum during World War I, and on February 5, 1917, Congress passed the progenitor of our present immigration law, codifying all previous exclusionary acts and going the rest of the way in laying the bases for our present Asia-Pacific triangle; it declared inadmissible all natives of China, India, Burma, Siam, the Malay States; the eastern part of Russia; part of Arabia and Persia; Afghanistan; most of the Polynesian islands; and the East Indies. Instead of calling it a triangle, the act labeled the area a barred zone.

Seven years later, Congress passed the 1924 Immigration Act, which not only continued exclusion of the barred zone peoples but also brought to an end the gentlemen's agreement, thereby excluding Japanese immigration to the United States.

This exclusionary law of 1924 elicited vehement protests, especially from the Japanese Government, and many have said that this was one of the circumstances that brought on World War II.

Mike M. Masaoka, national legislative director of the Japanese-American Citizens League, testified in the 1951 joint hearings on the Immigration Act as follows:

To the oriental, Congress divided the world into two parts in 1924 when it approved an immigration law prohibiting the entry of Asiatics into this country for permanent residence. In effect, Congress informed the peoples of Europe, Africa, and the Western

Hemisphere that they were considered superior, desirable, welcome to immigrate to the United States, while condemning the peoples of Asia and the Pacific Islands as inferior, unfit, undesirable, not good enough.

Included in this act was the concept of the national origins system in American immigration policy, which was first proposed for legislative enactment by Representative John Jacob Rogers as an amendment to the immigration bill then being considered by the House. Mr. Rogers, defining the system, made the following statement on the floor of the House:

We should . . . proportion our admission of immigrants, not to the numbers of racial or national representatives composing the alien colonies or foreign groups now in the country but to the quantities of the various racial and national elements which have passed the refining test of the melting pot and have become amalgamated in the structure of the American Nation. (65 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 6226.)

Madam President, you will remember that Senator Reed made the very same observation, which I quoted earlier.

The national origins system, according to Oscar Handlin, "ranked all the nations of the earth according to the order of precedence and assigned the largest number of admissions to those that were presumed to be closest in racial heritage to the original settlers of the United States." Its avowed purpose was concerned not with the immigrant's individual worth, but with his place of birth.

Our policies since the passage of the 1924 law to the present time have not been basically altered. While Chinese exclusion was repealed in 1943, and Filipinos and natives of India were declared admissible and eligible for naturalization in 1946, natives of the Asia-Pacific triangle area continue to be singled out under present immigration policies as deserving of very meager consideration for entry.

RACIAL STRICTURES OF THE 1952 IMMIGRATION ACT

Secretary of State Dean Acheson, testifying before the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization shortly after the passage of the 1952 act, advised the Commission that:

The lifting of the bar of exclusion caused deep gratification in Asia when the (1952) act was passed, but the racial discrimination apparent in the triangle provision can be expected to keep alive some feelings of resentment. . . . The combination of very small quotas for Asia and the Asia-Pacific triangle provisions still furnish ground for Asian suspicion of U.S. motives.

While the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 did eliminate the last of the absolute bars against the admission of persons from the Asiatic barred zone and permitted their naturalization, special provisions were written into the law to carefully hold the total number of immigrants coming from the barred zone to

September 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23559

an infinitely small fraction of total allowable annual immigration: 2,890 of 158,561, or 1.82 percent.

In our present immigration laws, we may count at least eight racially discriminatory provisions.

First. In 1924 the national origins system was conceived and annual quotas were allotted only to white nations. Polynesians, Orientals, and Negroes were totally excluded. In the 1952 act the national origins system was continued for white nations, while Oriental and Polynesian countries and the newly emerging nations of Africa were given minimal quotas of about 100 each.

Because nonwhite nations were excluded from the system, annual quota calculations were based only on the white population in the United States in 1920. As an example of how this annual quota was allocated to white nations, based on the 1920 census, there were about 39 million persons who derived their ancestry from the United Kingdom; one-sixth of 1 percent of 39 million is equal to about 66,000 persons, which is, then, the annual British quota.

One reason advanced during the debates over the 1952 act for excluding the African Negroes from the national origins computation was that the geographical origins of American Negroes could not be determined. This assumption was sharply challenged, however, by State Department geographers, who were able substantially to pinpoint their origins by tracing the original African railroad routes and the port of embarkation from which the Africans were transshipped to the United States.

While the natives of Africa were not enclosed in a triangle, there do exist special provisions, discussed below, that are designed to prevent Negro immigration to the United States—even from areas in the Western Hemisphere.

THE ASIA-PACIFIC TRIANGLE

Second. Under the 1952 act only 1.82 percent of the total annual immigration quotas was attached to the Asia-Pacific triangle, where more than one-half of the world's population live. In addition, involved regulations based on race have been issued by the administering agencies to carry out the requirements of the complicated triangle provisions.

The Asia-Pacific triangle, created by the 1952 law, comprises that area bounded by the meridians 60° east and 165° west longitude and by the parallel 25° south latitude. When traced on a map, the area actually appears as a triangle embracing all the Far East, southeast Asia, and all Pacific islands north of Australia and New Zealand—almost all of Polynesia and small portions of Micronesia and Melanesia.

The 21 quota areas of the Asia-Pacific triangle, largely independent nations, are as follows: Asia-Pacific—which I will

explain later—Afghanistan, Bhutan, Cambodia, Ceylon, China, Chinese persons—which I will explain later—India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Laos, Malaysia, Singapore, Nauru, Nepal, New Guinea, Pacific Islands—trust territories—Pakistan, Philippine Islands, Thailand, Vietnam, and Western Samoa.

Also included in the triangle are the following subquota areas, largely colonies and dependencies: Christmas Island; Cocos—Keeling—Island; and the territory of Papua, Australian dependencies; New Caledonia and the New Hebrides, French dependencies; the British Solomons, Brunei, Fiji, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Hong Kong, Maldive Islands, and Tonga, all British dependencies; the Ryukyus, presently under American administration; the Cook Islands, a New Zealand dependency; Macao, Portuguese India, and Timor, dependencies of Portugal.

Both the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice and the State Department administer the 1952 law.

By issuing special regulations on the triangle, for example, the State Department sought to delineate the races indigenous to the area within the triangle as well as those not indigenous. Those considered indigenous were the Dyaks of North Borneo, Sarawak, and Brunei; the Melanesians of the Fijis, New Caledonia, New Hebrides, Solomon Islands, and Nauru; the Micronesians of the Carolines, Marshalls, Marianas, Guam, and Gilbert Islands; the Negritos of Netherlands, New Guinea, Papua and New Zealand; the Parsees of India, the Pathans of Afghanistan and Pakistan; and the Sindi of Pakistan.

According to the same regulations, the Turkic race is not considered to be indigenous, while the Polynesian race in itself—including the Maoris—is not regarded as being either indigenous or not indigenous to the Asia-Pacific triangle. This depends entirely on the place of birth, the regulations explain:

A Polynesian born in Papua, which lies wholly within the Asia-Pacific triangle, is chargeable to the Asia-Pacific quota, but an alien of Polynesian ancestry born in French Oceania (which is outside the triangle) is chargeable to the subquota for French settlements in Oceania within the immigration quota established for France.

This regulation illustrates how involved and complex our present immigration policies really are.

Since all quota areas, except for Indonesia (with a quota of 200), Malaysia (400), Japan (185), and that for Chinese persons (105), are limited to the minimum quota of 100 guaranteed by the act, the total allowable annual immigration from the Asia-Pacific triangle is only 2,890, only 1.82 percent of the total yearly immigration to the United States of 158,561.

But that figure of 2,890 was only recently established.

Until September 26, 1961, when Congress passed Public Law 87-301, the Asia-Pacific triangle had been limited to a ceiling quota of 2,000. Had there been any more than 20 quota areas in the triangle, any newly established quota would have reduced the quota of other nations and dependencies proportionately. Section 9 of Public Law 87-301 repealed this inequitable ceiling.

Still, the fact that more than one-half of the world's population live in the triangle area does not square with an annual allotment of only 2,890 immigrants. The effect of these provisions is to permit the great majority of quota immigrants—over 81 percent—to come from northern and western Europe, and to allow more than 98 percent from Europe alone.

The unfairness of this system is nowhere more evident than in the previously stated facts that, for example, Ireland, with a population of 2,815,000, has a larger quota than all Asia; that we take more people from Switzerland than we do from the entire African Continent; that Rumania, a captive nation of the Iron Curtain, has a quota of 289, which is small enough, but is nearly a third more than our quota for India and the Philippines combined.

Because of the very small quotas assigned the triangle nations, according to the quota report of the State Department dated August 1, 1965, the quotas of nearly every area within the triangle are heavily oversubscribed. For example, short of an extraordinary act of Congress, or the passage of immigration reforms, the non-preference quota for Chinese persons is so heavily mortgaged into the future—by immigrants already admitted into the United States—that State Department officials say that for all practical purposes, it has already been exhausted in perpetuity. Japan's quota is filled up at least until the year 1989; the quota for Okinawa, which does not fall under Japan's but under a special Asia-Pacific quota of 100 shared by 20 other dependencies, is backlogged for 48 years, until the year 2011; the Philippines quota is 89 years behind. Only the quotas of Afghanistan, Cambodia, Malaya, Laos, and Nepal are open—since these are countries which generally have not sought immigration beyond their borders.

RACE OR ANCESTRY IS DETERMINATIVE

Thrd. While place of birth determines the quota under which a white person would fall, race or ancestry is determinative for Polynesian and oriental persons.

Normally, each nation's quota may be used only by persons born there. Present or past residence or citizenship is irrelevant. A person born in Italy, for example, will be eligible for only the Italian

quota, even if he has become an English citizen and has worked and lived in England for many years.

But the 1952 Immigration Act's provisions spell out special, rather complicated stipulations applicable to oriental persons wherever born. Orientals born outside of Asia are rendered ineligible for the quota of their birthplace. Instead, anyone deriving as much as half his ancestry from persons who were born in or whose race is indigenous to the Asiatic area is eligible only for one of the tiny Asiatic quotas.

If the country of his oriental ancestors can be determined, he is eligible for only its quota. For example, a person born in London to an English father and an Indian mother would have to wait his turn under India's annual quota of 100, even if he had lived all his life in London; under present oversubscribed quota conditions, he would have to wait for at least 159 years.

Yet, if a person's ancestry is mixed or cannot be traced, he is eligible for only the special quota of 100 allotted to "Asia Pacific," more commonly called the triangle quota. This was a quota created for such people, and to cover the 18 colonies and dependencies—called sub-quota areas by the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952—in the triangle area. For example, a person born, say, in Brazil of a Korean mother and a Japanese father wishing to enter the United States would be assigned to the so-called triangle quota; an immigrant born in Germany of a Malayan father and a German mother is charged to the triangle quota.

THE TRIANGLE QUOTA

Fourth, Section 202(b) (1) of the act thus established a special triangle quota of 100 to which thousands of oriental and Polynesian peoples living all over the world and in over 18 dependencies in the triangle area must be assigned. The triangle quota is, geographically speaking, a general quota, not tied down to any specific area.

Who, then, must be assigned to this quota of 100 persons?

Not immigrants born within a separate quota area situated wholly within the triangle, for such person must be charged to the quota of the separate quota area in which he was born. For example, a Japanese born in Japan must come under the Japanese quota.

Not immigrants born outside the triangle whose ancestry is attributable by one-half to an ethnic group indigenous to not more than one separate quota area in the triangle, since these persons would fall under the quota of that quota area. For example, an Indonesian born in Germany of an Indonesian mother and a German father would be attributed to the Indonesian quota.

Persons chargeable to the triangle quota fall into three categories:

First, Immigrants whose ancestry is 50 percent or more Asian, except Chinese, and who were born in a colony or other dependent area located in the triangle, are allocated to the triangle quota. They are specifically excepted from the provisions of section 202(c) (1), which allows persons born in colonial areas to draw from the quota of the governing nation to the extent of 100 persons. This provision is available only to white persons born in those dependencies. For instance, the New Hebrides, an archipelago in the south-central Pacific and a French protectorate, may not have a separate quota for native islanders or Asians born in the New Hebrides. Its subquota of 100, taken from the undersubscribed French quota, is available only to white persons born there. Only by a determination of the Secretary of State that it is an independent country may the New Hebrides have its own quota. As the law presently stands, the native of New Hebrides and Asians born in those islands share the triangle quota of 100 with 17 other subquota areas and an indeterminate number of persons born outside the triangle.

The Ryukyus, however, provide a rather complex problem in this regard. Those islands are now assigned to the triangle quota by administrative determination of the State Department and are under U.S. administration and jurisdiction assigned by the United Nations Trusteeship Council. While Japan now has residual sovereignty, should the United States relinquish its administrative rights and full sovereignty revert to Japan, would the Ryukyus still fall under the triangle quota, or would it be assigned to that of Japan? Presumably, if they are deemed a colony or dependency, the Ryukyus would remain under the triangle quota. But if they are considered wholly a part of the sovereign nation of Japan, of course, they would be a part of that quota area. I will have more to say on the Ryukyus later in my talk.

Second, Immigrants born outside the triangle whose ancestry is one-half attributable to a people indigenous to one or more colonies or other dependent area located in the triangle must be charged to the triangle quota. For example, a person born in Spain who is one-half Spanish and one-half Tongan must be charged to the triangle quota.

Third, Immigrants born outside the triangle whose ancestry may be traced to peoples indigenous to two or more separate quota areas in the triangle, except Chinese persons, must be attributed to the triangle quota. That is, a person born in France who is one-half Filipino and one-half Japanese would be charged to the triangle quota.

THE CHINESE PERSONS QUOTA

Fifth, There are two quotas for China—100 for the few white persons born in China and only 105 for the millions of Chinese persons, wherever born. One quota, designated the China quota, is reserved for persons born in Manchuria, Inner and Outer Mongolia, Sinkiang, Tibet, Taiwan, and the area of the Chinese mainland bounded by the 1938 boundaries. A second quota of 105 was established for Chinese persons.

The reason for this lies in the history of the exclusion of Chinese from American shores. Prior to the repeal of Chinese exclusion in 1943, since Chinese persons were ineligible for entry into the United States, the quota for China was used for white persons born on the China mainland. The 1952 immigration law specifically provided in section 201(a) that: "the quota existing for Chinese persons prior to the date of enactment of this act shall be continued." Thus, the practice of allotting the China quota to whites was continued and necessitated the creation of a second quota—for Chinese persons.

To assign a quota of 100 to the few thousand, at most, white persons born in China and only 5 more quota numbers to the entire Chinese world population speaks loudly as to the extremes to which our law has gone in discriminating against a people.

To the quota of Chinese persons were allocated all persons with as much as one-half Chinese blood, wherever born. This would be true, according to the State Department, even if the Chinese person were born in a subquota area located in the triangle. It matters not one whit whether his family had lived in the United Kingdom, Brazil, or in the New Hebrides for generations; if he is one-half Chinese, he is mandatorily allocated to the Chinese persons quota.

Sixth, Although present immigration law grants nonquota status to persons born in the Western Hemisphere, this is greatly diminished by two racial provisions:

First, The special restrictions on orientals apply with equal measure to orientals born in hemispheric nations. For example, a native of Canada born of a Japanese mother and a Canadian father is not a nonquota immigrant, although he is a native of an independent country located in the Western Hemisphere. He must be charged to the quota for Japan.

Second, Nonquota status is denied persons born in colonies of the Western Hemisphere. The immigration law provides that each colony or other dependent area is limited to a quota of 100 a year to be taken from its parent country's quota. As several witnesses to the 1951 joint hearings pointed out, plainly, this provision is aimed squarely against the Negroes of Jamaica, Trinidad, other

West Indian and Latin American areas, who make up most of the immigrants from those areas. These immigrants formerly could take advantage of the consistently unfilled quotas of their mother countries. This was true particularly of the British quota, which had been utilized more by West Indians than by other British subjects. The Immigration Act of 1952 has effectively restricted such immigration.

Seventh. Our present law clearly discriminates, not only against orientals and Negroes, but also against persons of eastern European, Middle Eastern, and Mediterranean origins. The combined quotas for Greece, Turkey, and Spain, for example, come to 783, which is roughly one-third of the quota we allot to Norway.

Moreover, oversubscription plagues the quotas of nations from these areas as it does nation and dependencies in the triangle. Italy's quota is subscribed for some 47 years; Yugoslavia's for 35 years; Iran's for 86 years; Israel's for 157 years; Lebanon's for 31 years. Were it not for the fact that, by special legislation in 1957, Congress forgave the mortgages charged against nations from which immigrants entered the United States under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, Latvian and Greek quotas, for example, would have been mortgaged until the years 2274 and 2014, respectively.

Eighth. Under the 1952 act, an Asian family of mixed blood may be separated in migration if the wife is accountable to an oversubscribed quota, although her husband is chargeable to an open quota. On the other hand, a non-Asian wife accountable to an oversubscribed quota may be given the quota of her immigrant husband, if he is fortunate enough to have access to an open quota.

THE PENDING BILL, H.R. 2580

The bill, H.R. 2580, now before the Senate eliminates all racial discrimination from American immigration laws by doing away with the national origins quota system over a 3-year period ending July 1, 1968. The Asia-Pacific triangle is entirely abolished.

In its place, a ceiling of 170,000 regular immigrants a year is made applicable on a first-come, first qualified basis for all nations outside the Western Hemisphere, with a limitation of 20,000 from any one country in a single year.

In addition to the numerical ceilings, the bill sets up a series of preference categories that give priority to minor children, the spouses and parents of persons who have become citizens or permanent residents.

Below the family priorities, other priorities are set for members of the arts and professions; for skilled and unskilled

workers for whom jobs are assured that do not displace American workers; and for refugees driven from their homes by political, racial, or religious persecution.

The bill also provides for the establishment of a Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration, and the imposition of a ceiling of 120,000 quota immigrants from the Western Hemisphere, beginning July 1, 1968; this ceiling becomes effective on that date, unless the Commission recommends another course of action.

During Judiciary Committee deliberations on the Western Hemisphere ceiling, I had suggested additional language providing that these immigrant visas be allocated in accordance with the same preference categories as those which apply to the Eastern Hemisphere, as provided in section 3 of the bill. I felt that this amendment was necessary, because under sections 3 and 10 of the bill, the Secretary of Labor is required to make an affirmative finding that each intending immigrant has a job assured, that he would not displace any American worker and would not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of American workers similarly employed.

This would mean that immigrants who are relatives of American citizens and resident aliens, who normally would fall under one of three preference categories provided for in section 3 of the bill, would be subject to the Secretary's required affirmative finding and would not be accorded preferential status. Thus, Western Hemisphere relatives of citizens and permanent residents would be discriminated against in the following categories: First, unmarried children of U.S. citizens—first preference under section 3 of the bill—second, spouses and unmarried children of alien permanent residents—second preference—and, third, brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens—fifth preference.

At my suggestion, the committee decided to include in the report the consensus of the committee that this matter would be considered by the Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration in the course of its study.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who has so ably conducted hearings on this legislation and is now floor managing it—am I not correct in this matter?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator from Hawaii is correct. He brought this matter to the attention of the committee. In response to the Senator, let me say that the language included in the report on page 27, reads as follows:

There was also discussed a proposal to amend section 21 of the bill relating to the

establishment of a numerical limitation on Western Hemisphere immigration on July 1, 1968. Additional language was suggested to be added to section 21(e) to provide that immigrant visas be allocated to any immigrant who becomes subject to the numerical limitation under the same system of preferences applicable to other immigrants as specified in section 203 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. It was the consensus of the committee that this is a matter that will be considered by the Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration in the course of its study.

Mr. FONG. I thank the distinguished Senator for his answer.

Mr. President, two other matters of statutory interpretation were adopted by the Judiciary Committee and included in its report.

The first refers to the Ryukyu Islands situation, which I described earlier. I did not press for statutory language to correct a long-standing inequity regarding the Ryukyus—resulting from the fact that those islands are presently included in the triangle quota.

I have a letter which was sent to me from the Department of State containing the following commitment:

Intending immigrants from the Ryukyu Islands will undoubtedly benefit from the abolition of the Asia-Pacific triangle provisions of existing law. When this occurs, it is contemplated that the Secretary of State will invoke the authority granted him by * * * Section 202(b) of H.R. 2580, and attribute the Ryukyu Islands to the quota area of the Pacific Islands. Native Ryukyuans will then share the quota numbers allotted from the Pacific Islands quota (during the transition period) and in addition, will have access to the numbers assigned to the quota pool under H.R. 2580.

Thus, native Ryukyuans will share the quota numbers allotted from the Pacific Islands quota and, in addition, will have access to the numbers assigned to the quota pool under the bill. The Ryukyu Islands and the Pacific Islands together will constitute one quota area which will be restricted, like any other quota area, to not more than 20,000 quota numbers annually.

The Judiciary Committee included this commitment of the Department of State in its report as an understanding of the committee. I ask the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, is this not correct?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator is again correct. In response to the Senator's raising of this point the committee stated, on page 27 of the report:

The attention of the committee was also directed to an immigration problem of the natives of the Ryukyu Islands resulting from the fact that those islands are presently included within the areas assigned to the Asia-Pacific triangle quota. It is the com-

23562

mittee's understanding that in the event H.R. 2580 becomes law, it is contemplated that the Secretary of State will attribute the Ryukyu Islands to the quota area of the Pacific Islands and that during the 3-year interim period natives of the Ryukyu Islands will have access to the Pacific Islands quota.

Mr. FONG. I thank the distinguished Senator for his reply.

Mr. President, the second matter of statutory interpretation refers to the status of refugees from the Dominican Republic. At my suggestion, the committee in its report expressed its opinion that the refugees who fled the country as a result of the recent rebellion may be considered within the provisions of sections 203(a)(7) and 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act as amended by H.R. 2580.

Again, I ask the Senator from Massachusetts, is this not correct?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator is correct. In response to the Senator's suggestion, the committee added this language to its report, on page 27, as follows:

The committee discussed the status of refugees from the Dominican Republic and is of the opinion the refugees who fled the country as a result of the recent rebellion may be considered within the provisions of section 203(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by H.R. 2580, as well as under section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended.

Those are the provisions in section 203(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the adjustments and changes which were made in the proposed legislation.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I should like to add at this time my highest commendation of the excellent work of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. He was the acting chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, and he guided the proceedings throughout the many lengthy hearings. He was always most fair and very patient.

He gave to everyone concerned every opportunity to speak on the bill. It is through his very great leadership and guidance that we have this very excellent bill before us today. I congratulate the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts for his diligence, his dedication, and his most conscientious efforts in bringing about a consensus of opinion in the U.S. Senate that immigration reform legislation is long overdue.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I thank the Senator from Hawaii. I wanted to express my views, at the end of his very splendid address, on his contributions.

Mr. FONG. I thank the Senator.

The bill also contains three amendments which I had proposed during the executive sessions of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, and which the subcommittee adopted.

One amendment provides that all aliens who have lived in the United States for 7 years and who entered the country before June 28, 1958, may have their statuses adjusted—so that they may eventually become U.S. citizens.

A second amendment allows the issuance of visas to students—previously denied admission—upon posting bond and showing proof of acceptance at a recognized educational institution.

A third amendment allows refugees from nations of the Western Hemisphere who are now living in the United States, and who have fled persecution or fear of persecution because of race, religion, or political belief from Communist or Communist-dominated countries, to adjust their statuses without having to return to those countries.

Mr. President, I have three tables of estimated quota area and immigration pool issuances under H.R. 2580 during fiscal years 1966, 1967, and 1968, which were issued by the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the Department of State; these tables were accompanied by an explanatory memorandum.

I ask unanimous consent that these tables, together with the memorandum, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAR- RIS in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the memorandum and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESTIMATED QUOTA AREA AND IMMIGRATION POOL ISSUANCES UNDER H.R. 2580, AS AMENDED AUGUST 6, 1965, DURING FISCAL YEAR 1966, 1967, AND 1968

The attached tables outline the estimated issuances of national quota and immigration pool numbers during the first, second, and third years (transition period) under H.R. 2580, as reported out by the House Judiciary Committee August 6, 1965. The estimated issuances are within the percentage limitations for the seven preferences, within the overall numerical limitation, and within the 20,000 per foreign state limitation where applicable.

One hundred and two thousand eight hundred and ninety-three quota numbers were actually issued in fiscal year 1965 under the present authorized total quota of 158,561. Thus, 55,668 unused numbers will constitute the immigration pool which under section 201(d) of H.R. 2580 will be available only for issuance in fiscal year 1966 to applicants in the oversubscribed preference categories and to refugees.

As the pattern and volume of immigration under the national quota system has been relatively constant for the past several years, the first year estimates are based on fiscal year 1965 actual issuance figures on the assumption that this pattern and volume will remain essentially the same in fiscal year 1966.

The second- and third-year estimates are necessarily based more upon global experience of operation under the present law for the last 13 years and the estimates for the first-year operations under H.R. 2580, since no firm figure can be derived for the unused quota numbers which will constitute the immigration pool in fiscal year 1967 and 1968 until after June 30, 1966 and 1967.

To arrive at estimates, we have assumed a continuing demand within each of the

preference classes. Pool usage in all preferences other than fifth preference (brothers and sisters) will, however, be lower than the first-year issuances because most of the current oversubscriptions in those categories will have been satisfied during the first year. In the fifth preference there will be a substantial carryover of unsatisfied demand which will cause full usage of the pool in the second year. The carryover of unused numbers to the third year, however, will be smaller so that the pool will not be fully utilized in that year.

The preference categories under present law have been translated into the new six classes (plus refugees) of H.R. 2580. This necessitated a division of the percentage of usage of three of the preference categories in the present law. The present second preference (parents and unmarried sons and daughters of U.S. citizens) has been divided into two groups: (1) Parents, who will fall outside of the quota system as "immediate relatives," and (2) unmarried sons and daughters, who will be granted first preference status. Since parents have heretofore consistently accounted for approximately 90 percent of the total issuances to this preference group and under H.R. 2580 will not be subject to any numerical ceiling, the projection of new first preference usage is the remaining 10 percent of such past issuances.

The present fourth preference (married sons and daughters and brothers and sisters) is another category which was divided to fit the new preference categories. Under the present law brothers and sisters have utilized approximately 90 percent of the numbers available to these applicants. Usage in the new fourth preference (married sons and daughters) is, therefore, predicated on 10 percent of the usage of the present fourth preference.

The new fifth preference (brothers and sisters) is based on the remaining 90 percent of issuance under the present fourth preference. This category is so heavily oversubscribed that there will be substantial demand from the pool for numbers for this class of applicants.

Persons of exceptional skill who have previously entered the United States under the present first preference will be attributable under the new system to one of the two new categories: members of the professions (third preference) or skilled and unskilled short-supply labor (sixth preference). The bases for the estimates in these categories was provided by the Immigration and Naturalization Service which reviewed past admissions of such persons to determine the number who were members of the professions (new third preference) and the number who would more appropriately fall within the definition of the new sixth preference (short-supply labor).

The determination of estimates of visa issuances within preference breakdowns in countries that are now undersubscribed (such as Great Britain and Germany) necessarily differed, since applicants issued visas under those quotas have not had to prove preference status in order to receive quota numbers and, therefore, most entered as nonpreference immigrants. The basis for these estimates, therefore, is an evaluation of the percentages of issuances in the quotas of three countries (France, Netherlands, and Switzerland) which are presently slightly oversubscribed in the nonpreference category and, therefore, required that persons eligible for preference status use preference numbers. The average of the percentage of

September 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23563

issuance in each preference class for these three countries was applied to the issuance levels of countries now with current quotas, (Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Great Britain, Ireland, Norway, and Sweden).

Spouses and children of U.S. citizens are entitled to nonquota status under the present law. However, many have entered from undersubscribed quota countries (particularly Great Britain and Germany) as non-preference quota immigrants. Under H.R. 2580 they, as well as parents, will be required to obtain visas as immediate rela-

tives not chargeable to any numerical ceiling.

It is anticipated that the use of national quota numbers will drop by approximately 10,000 per year due to the "immediate relative" classification. Therefore, the worldwide national quota area estimated usage has been reduced by 10,000 in the second- and third-year tabulations. It has been reduced by 6,667 in the first year as visa issuance under present quotas will continue until the effective date of H.R. 2580.

The attached tables do not set forth in

a separate category estimated numbers of the total authorized issuances which will be used for adjustment of status of persons already in the United States. They are included in the individual country national quota estimates against which such adjustments are required to be charged.

During fiscal year 1966, 1967, and 1968, 10,200 numbers (6 percent of 170,000 ceiling) are allotted to refugees for conditional entry (seventh preference) from the pool of 55,668 in 1966; 62,335 in 1967, and 65,668 in 1968.

29564

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 20, 1965

Estimated issuances under H.R. 2580, as amended Aug. 6, 1965
1ST YEAR (FISCAL YEAR 1966)

Quota area	Total issuances			1st preference— Unmarried sons, daughters of U.S. citizens			2d preference— Spouses, unmarried sons, daughters of permanent residents			3d preference— Members of pro- fessions, etc.			4th preference— Married sons, daughters of U.S. citizens			5th preference— Brothers, sisters of U.S. citizens			6th preference— Skilled or un- skilled labor, etc.			7th preference— Refugees			Non- preference
	Total	Area quota	Pool	Total	Area quota	Pool	Total	Area quota	Pool	Total	Area quota	Pool	Total	Area quota	Pool	Total	Area quota	Pool	Total	Area quota	Pool	Total	Area quota	Pool	
All quota areas.....	151,804	98,228	55,668	1,484	1,108	376	15,676	7,214	8,462	9,202	3,635	5,567	8,374	2,874	5,500	30,784	10,788	19,998	7,686	2,119	5,567	10,200	10,200	10,200	68,488
Refugees.....	10,200	10,200	10,200	1,063	1,063	148	13,023	6,620	6,403	2,511	2,203	308	6,713	2,813	3,900	26,211	10,462	15,749	1,935	1,027	308	10,200	10,200	10,200	66,686
Europe.....	118,288	91,424	55,668	1,209	1,063	148	13,023	6,620	6,403	2,511	2,203	308	6,713	2,813	3,900	26,211	10,462	15,749	1,935	1,027	308	10,200	10,200	10,200	66,686
Albania.....	116	100	16	1	1	1	15	15	15	107	107	107	6	6	4	39	39	12	32	32	32				55
Austria.....	1,405	1,405	1,405	2	2	2	48	48	48	107	107	107	4	4	4	39	39	12	32	32	32				1,173
Belgium.....	923	923	923	10	10	10	34	34	34	107	107	107	30	30	30	39	39	12	32	32	32				840
Bulgaria.....	112	100	12	1	1	1	4	4	4	6	6	6	5	5	5	31	31	22	9	9	9				57
Czechoslovakia.....	2,037	2,037	2,037	23	23	23	71	71	71	51	51	51	67	67	67	131	131	19	19	19	19				1,743
Denmark.....	1,175	1,175	1,175	1	1	1	29	29	29	51	51	51	3	3	3	22	22	7	6	6	6				1,030
Estonia.....	115	115	115	1	1	1	3	3	3	26	26	26	1	1	1	109	109	62	62	62	62				97
Finland.....	566	566	566	1	1	1	44	44	44	238	238	238	12	12	12	62	62	62	62	62	62				418
France.....	2,748	2,748	2,748	6	6	6	123	123	123	112	112	112	12	12	12	109	109	62	62	62	62				2,139
Subquotas (6).....	321	321	321	226	226	226	816	816	816	353	353	353	622	622	622	948	948	11	11	11	11				1,743
Germany.....	18,566	18,566	18,566	289	289	289	816	816	816	353	353	353	622	622	622	948	948	11	11	11	11				1,743
Great Britain.....	25,238	25,238	25,238	15	15	15	616	616	616	108	108	108	168	168	168	1,472	1,472	25	25	25	25				2,139
Subquotas (25).....	4,042	4,042	4,042	83	83	83	734	734	734	41	41	41	685	685	685	865	865	2	2	2	2				1,743
Greece.....	4,193	4,193	4,193	22	22	22	131	131	131	26	26	26	76	76	76	14	14	62	62	62	62				1,743
Hungary.....	1,091	885	206	1	1	1	169	169	169	6	6	6	165	165	165	174	174	2	2	2	2				97
Ireland.....	1,000	1,000	1,000	55	55	55	6,122	6,122	6,122	342	342	342	331	331	331	11,367	11,367	2,738	2,738	2,738	2,738				2,139
Italy.....	5,246	5,246	5,246	2	2	2	7	7	7	10	10	10	3	3	3	25	25	25	25	25	25				1,743
Latvia.....	20,000	5,666	14,334	201	201	201	10	10	10	151	151	151	7	7	7	64	64	61	61	61	61				1,743
Lithuania.....	384	384	384	4	4	4	28	28	28	151	151	151	7	7	7	64	64	61	61	61	61				1,743
Luxembourg.....	100	100	100	1	1	1	34	34	34	15	15	15	7	7	7	26	26	26	26	26	26				1,743
Netherlands.....	2,940	2,940	2,940	23	23	23	71	71	71	101	101	101	295	295	295	799	799	4,473	4,473	4,473	4,473				2,139
Subquotas (2).....	2,297	2,297	2,297	34	34	34	917	917	917	51	51	51	1,064	1,064	1,064	799	799	4,473	4,473	4,473	4,473				2,139
Norway.....	9,068	6,488	3,425	54	54	54	1,139	1,139	1,139	862	862	862	51	51	51	799	799	4,473	4,473	4,473	4,473				2,139
Poland.....	3,863	3,863	3,863	17	17	17	57	57	57	10	10	10	89	89	89	15	15	74	74	74	74				2,139
Portugal.....	661	289	272	12	12	12	15	15	15	10	10	10	89	89	89	15	15	74	74	74	74				2,139
Subquotas (4).....	100	100	100	15	15	15	140	140	140	102	102	102	50	50	50	95	95	293	293	293	293				2,139
Romania.....	100	100	100	9	9	9	78	78	78	36	36	36	79	79	79	26	26	26	26	26	26				2,139
San Marino.....	787	250	537	24	24	24	48	48	48	84	84	84	79	79	79	26	26	26	26	26	26				2,139
Spain.....	2,363	2,363	2,363	1	1	1	82	82	82	47	47	47	163	163	163	66	66	175	175	175	175				2,139
Sweden.....	1,698	1,698	1,698	32	32	32	60	60	60	10	10	10	16	16	16	278	278	35	35	35	35				2,139
Switzerland.....	870	225	645	63	63	63	60	60	60	37	37	37	87	87	87	10	10	10	10	10	10				2,139
Turkey.....	2,697	2,697	2,697	20	20	20	419	419	419	39	39	39	278	278	278	35	35	241	241	241	241				2,139
U.S.S.R.....	1,824	942	882	20	20	20	39	39	39	39	39	39	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10				2,139
Yugoslavia.....	1,238	253	253	20	20	20	39	39	39	39	39	39	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10				2,139
Other Europe (5).....	20,783	2,844	17,939	208	39	229	2,474	455	2,019	5,883	830	5,153	1,495	22	1,473	4,127	214	3,913	5,624	372	5,152				912
Asia.....	121	100	21	1	1	1	13	13	13	13	13	13	11	5	6	56	41	15	8	8	8				32
Burma.....	8,119	100	8,019	136	1	135	675	46	46	2,155	40	2,145	810	2	808	2,165	20	2,145	2,145	2,145	2,145				100
Ceylon.....	2,976	100	2,876	6	3	3	121	19	102	1,386	53	1,333	29	29	29	76	21	93	6	6	6				32
Cyprus.....	519	100	419	6	6	6	37	37	37	49	49	49	7	7	7	53	46	54	25	25	25				32
India.....	521	100	421	6	6	6	68	20	48	209	169	169	20	20	20	53	46	54	25	25	25				32
Indonesia.....	475	100	375	5	5	5	89	20	74	53	42	11	91	1	90	243	4	239	130	32	32				32
Iran.....	971	100	871	5	5	5	89	20	74	53	42	11	91	1	90	243	4	239	130	32	32				32
Iraq.....	475	100	375	5	5	5	89	20	74	53	42	11	91	1	90	243	4	239	130	32	32				32
Israel.....	971	100	871	5	5	5	89	20	74	53	42	11	91	1	90	243	4	239	130	32	32				32
Japan.....	137	100	37	21	5	16	143	36	107	298	96	202	46	11	45	128	7	119	21	40	207				32
Jordan.....	1,112	100	1,012	7	2	5	88	18	70	497	55	442	11	1	10	35	8	53	438	23	443				32
Korea.....	216	100	116	4	3	1	50	20	30	31	30	1	24	1	14	38	8	53	438	23	443				32
Lebanon.....	266	100	166	1	1	1	50	20	30	31	30	1	24	1	14	38	8	53	438	23	443				32
Pakistan.....	3,320	100	3,220	63	2	61	788	12	756	796	53	683	288	5	5	70	13	13	114	17	67				32
Philippines.....	100	100	100	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4				32
Thailand.....	100	100	100	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4				32
Vietnam.....	100	100	100	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4				32
Yemen.....	100	100	100	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4				32
Other Asia (14).....	1,240	859	381	11	9	2	106	4	105	212	212	212	76	1	75	211	11	199	32	32	32				32

Africa.....	1,963	1,492	471	5	4	1	123	107	26	329	284	45	109	11	98	350	94	255	110	65	45	972
Ethiopia.....	91						1	1														90
Ghana.....	100	100					3	3														87
Libya.....	113	100	13				1	1														55
Morocco.....	190	100	90	2	2		32	32														32
South Africa.....	148	100	48				18	18														32
Tunisia.....	148	100	48				18	18														32
Other Africa (31).....	1,173	901	272	1	1	1	68	42	26	221	193	28	55	3	52	163	26	137	53	26	28	611
Oceania.....	710	466	244	2	2		46	32	14	379	318	61	57	28	29	96	18	78	117	55	62	13
Australia.....	339	100	239	2	2		34	20	14	84	23	61	55	27	28	75	1	74	89	27	62	
New Zealand.....	104	100	4				12	12								20	17	3	28	28		10
Other Oceania (4).....	267	266	1							263	263							1				3

2D YEAR (FISCAL YEAR 1967)

All quota areas.....	155,228	92,893	62,335	1,270	1,108	162	8,214	7,214	1,000	6,361	3,635	2,726	6,065	2,874	3,191	5,318	10,788	42,330	4,845	2,119	2,726	10,200	65,155
Refugees.....	10,200		10,200																			10,200	
Europe.....	124,386	88,091	36,295	1,075	1,063	12	7,380	6,620	760	2,359	2,203	156	5,295	2,813	2,482	43,191	10,462	32,729	1,783	1,627	156		63,363
Albania.....	124	100	24				15	15															55
Austria.....	1,405	1,405		1	2		48	48															1,173
Belgium.....	859	859		10	10		34	34															736
Bulgaria.....	124	100	24				4	4															57
Czechoslovakia.....	2,004	2,004		23	23		71	71															1,710
Denmark.....	1,175	1,175		1	1		29	29															1,060
Estonia.....	1,115	1,115		1	1		3	3															97
Finland.....	566	566		1	1		44	44															418
France.....	2,748	2,748		6	6		129	129															2,189
Subquotas (6).....	321	321					18	18															300
Germany.....	16,399	16,399		226	226		816	816															13,664
Great Britain.....	24,405	24,405		289	289		896	896															21,014
Subquotas (25).....	4,957	4,957		15	15		633	616															4,004
Greece.....	6,431	6,431		6	6		123	123															5,589
Hungary.....	1,181	865	316	22	22		131	131															1,771
Iceland.....	100	100		1	1																		44
Ireland.....	5,113	5,113		55	55		169	169															44
Italy.....	20,000	5,666	14,334	201	201		1,948	1,400															4,542
Latvia.....	235	235		4	4		7	7															185
Lithuania.....	384	384					10	10															331
Luxembourg.....	100	100		1	1		28	28															100
Netherlands.....	2,940	2,940		1	1		34	34															2,628
Norway.....	196	196		23	23		71	71															183
Subquotas (2).....	2,264	2,264		34	34		917	917															2,012
Poland.....	11,924	6,458	5,436	40	37		377	377															2,359
Portugal.....	5,928	5,928		12	12		57	57															5,068
Subquotas (4).....	289	289	389	12	12		15	15															2,211
Rumania.....	100	100		16	16		70	70															100
San Marino.....	800	250	550	1	1		61	61															78
Spain.....	2,236	2,236		24	24		78	78															2,010
Sweden.....	1,698	1,698		1	1		48	48															1,405
Switzerland.....	730	225	505	21	21		40	40															2,359
Turkey.....	2,697	2,697		8	8		60	60															2,445
Y.S.S.R.....	3,131	942	2,189	20	20		419	419															2,445
Yugoslavia.....	288	288					39	39															116
Other Europe (5).....																							
Asia.....	17,919	2,844	15,075	189	39	150	690	455	235	3,348	830	2,518	675	22	653	9,216	214	9,002	2,889	372	2,517	91	
Burma.....	124	100	24	1	1		13	13															32
Ceylon.....	100	100																					100
China.....	7,651	100	7,551	84	1	83	108	108															
Cyprus.....	270	100	170	3	3		31	31															
India.....	1,546	100	1,446	1	1		27	27															
Indonesia.....	224	200	24	1	1		20	20															
Iran.....	356	100	256	2	2		28	28															
Israel.....	337	100	237	3	3		26	26															
Japan.....	622	185	437	9	5	4	37	37															
Jordan.....	455	100	355	3	3		26	26															
Korea.....	660	100	560	3	3		26	26															
Lebanon.....	224	100	124	3	3		20	20															
Pakistan.....	191	100	91	1	1		22	22															
Philippines.....	3,292	100	3,192	62	2	60	100	100															
Thailand.....	100	100					19	19															
Vietnam.....	100	100					4	4															
Yemen.....	100	100					4	4															
Other Asia (14).....	984	859	125	10	9	1	91	91															502

Footnotes at end of table.

23566

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 20, 1965

Estimated issuances under H.R. 2580, as amended Aug. 6, 1965—Continued
2D YEAR (FISCAL YEAR 1967)

Quota area	Total issuances			1st preference— Unmarried sons, daughters of U.S. citizens		2d preference— Spouses, unmarried sons, daughters of permanent residents		3d preference— Members of pro- fessions, etc.		4th preference— Married sons, daughters of U.S. citizens		5th preference— Brothers, sisters of U.S. citizens		6th preference— Skilled or un- skilled labor, etc.		7th preference— Refugees			Non- preference			
	Total	Area quota	Pool	Total	Area quota	Pool	Total	Area quota	Pool	Total	Area quota	Pool	Total	Area quota	Pool	Total	Area quota	Pool				
Africa.....	2,051	1,492	559		4	4	110	107	3	307	284	23	54	11	43	560	94	496	89	65	24	927
Ethiopia.....	91	91					1	1														90
Ghana.....	100	100					3	3														97
Libya.....	124	100	24				1	1														55
Morocco.....	221	100	121		2	2	32	32	21	21			5	3	2	49	27	22	2	2		32
South Africa.....	143	100	43				18	18	61	52	9		11	1	10	117	6	111	6			43
Tunisia.....	173	100	73				10	10	6	6			2		2	22	35	67	2	2		611
Other Africa (31).....	1,199	901	298		1	1	45	42	3	207	193	14	26	3	23	270	26	244	39	25	14	
Oceania.....	672	466	206		2	2	34	32	2	347	318	29	41	28	13	151	18	133	84	55	29	13
Australia.....	306	100	206		2	2	22	20	2	52	23	29	40	27	13	134	1	133	66	27	29	10
New Zealand.....	100	100					12	12		32	32			1		17			28	28		3
Other Oceania (4).....	266	266								263	263		1									

3D YEAR (FISCAL YEAR 1968)

All quota areas	Total		1st preference— Unmarried sons, daughters of U.S. citizens		2d preference— Sponsors, unmarried sons, daughters of permanent residents		3d preference— Members of pro- fessions, etc.		4th preference— Married sons, daughters of U.S. citizens		5th preference— Brothers, sisters of U.S. citizens		6th preference— Skilled or un- skilled labor, etc.		7th preference— Refugees		Non- preference
	Total	Area quota	Total	Area quota	Total	Area quota	Total	Area quota	Total	Area quota	Total	Area quota	Total	Area quota	Total	Area quota	
Refugees.....	130,865	92,892	37,972	1,270	1,108	162											65,155
Europe.....	107,928	83,091	19,837	1,075	1,063	12											63,303
Albania.....	108	100	8	1	1												55
Austria.....	1,405	1,405															1,173
Belgium.....	869	869															736
Bulgaria.....	108	100	8	10	10												57
Czechoslovakia.....	2,004	2,004															1,710
Denmark.....	1,175	1,175															1,050
Estonia.....	1,115	1,115															97
Finland.....	588	588															418
France.....	2,748	2,748															2,189
Germany.....	2,321	2,321															300
Greece.....	16,390	16,390															13,694
Great Britain.....	24,405	24,405															21,014
Hungary.....	4,231	4,231															1,771
Ireland.....	1,883	1,883															443
Italy.....	1,984	1,984															99
Japan.....	100	100															4,542
Lithuania.....	5,113	5,113															335
Luxembourg.....	20,000	20,000															100
Netherlands.....	235	235															2,638
Norway.....	384	384															2,012
Poland.....	2,940	2,940															2,339
Portugal.....	2,264	2,264															78
Romania.....	7,726	7,726															2,010
Spain.....	1,763	1,763															1,496
Sweden.....	411	411															2,445
Switzerland.....	100	100															93
Turkey.....	2,206	2,206															116
U.S.S.R.....	1,698	1,698															
Yugoslavia.....	497	497															
Other Europe (5).....	2,697	2,697															

September 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23567

Asia	10,362	2,844	7,518	189	39	150	600	455	235	13,343	830	2,518	675	22	653	1,659	214	1,445	2,389	372	2,517	912
Burma	108	100	100	8	1	1	13	13	75	1,071	40	1,031	360	2	368	680	20	660	1,062	4	1,088	32
Ceylon	100	100	3,265	84	1	1	108	33	46	24	24	15	15	2	15	680	20	30	6	6	100	32
China	3,363	100	1,346	3	3	3	46	46	13	697	53	644	13	5	13	33	21	33	669	25	644	100
Cyprus	154	100	1,346	3	3	3	31	31	13	49	49	77	7	5	13	33	21	33	669	25	644	100
India	1,446	100	1,346	3	3	3	31	31	13	49	49	77	7	5	13	33	21	33	669	25	644	100
Indonesia	208	100	1,346	3	3	3	31	31	13	49	49	77	7	5	13	33	21	33	669	25	644	100
Iran	239	100	1,346	3	3	3	31	31	13	49	49	77	7	5	13	33	21	33	669	25	644	100
Iraq	237	100	1,346	3	3	3	31	31	13	49	49	77	7	5	13	33	21	33	669	25	644	100
Israel	237	100	1,346	3	3	3	31	31	13	49	49	77	7	5	13	33	21	33	669	25	644	100
Japan	472	100	1,346	3	3	3	31	31	13	49	49	77	7	5	13	33	21	33	669	25	644	100
Korea	220	100	1,346	3	3	3	31	31	13	49	49	77	7	5	13	33	21	33	669	25	644	100
Lebanon	140	100	1,346	3	3	3	31	31	13	49	49	77	7	5	13	33	21	33	669	25	644	100
Pakistan	175	100	1,346	3	3	3	31	31	13	49	49	77	7	5	13	33	21	33	669	25	644	100
Philippines	1,367	100	1,346	3	3	3	31	31	13	49	49	77	7	5	13	33	21	33	669	25	644	100
Thailand	100	100	1,346	3	3	3	31	31	13	49	49	77	7	5	13	33	21	33	669	25	644	100
Vietnam	100	100	1,346	3	3	3	31	31	13	49	49	77	7	5	13	33	21	33	669	25	644	100
Yemen	100	100	1,346	3	3	3	31	31	13	49	49	77	7	5	13	33	21	33	669	25	644	100
Other Asia (14)	917	859	58	10	9	1	91	91	239	212	27	27	9	1	8	34	12	22	32	32	502	502
Africa	1,703	1,492	211	4	4	4	110	107	3	307	284	23	54	11	43	212	94	118	89	65	24	927
Ethiopia	91	91	91	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	927
Ghana	100	100	100	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	927
Libya	100	100	100	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	927
Morocco	137	100	100	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	927
South Africa	127	100	100	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	927
Tunisia	124	100	100	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	927
Other Africa (31)	1,016	991	115	1	1	1	45	42	3	207	103	14	26	3	23	87	26	61	39	14	611	611
Oceania	672	456	206	2	2	2	34	32	2	347	318	29	41	28	13	151	18	133	84	55	29	13
Australia	306	100	206	2	2	2	23	20	2	52	23	29	40	27	13	134	1	133	56	27	29	13
New Zealand	100	100	100	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	13
Other Oceania (4)	266	266	266	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	13

1 Exclusive of following number of estimated issuances to immediate relatives (nonquota): Great Britain, 1,666; Germany, 4,333; Belgium, 133; Sweden, 133; Ireland, 267; Czechoslovakia, 67; Norway, 67.
 2 Exclusive of following number of estimated issuances to immediate relatives (nonquota): Great Britain, 2,500; Germany, 6,500; Belgium, 200; Czechoslovakia, 100; Ireland, 400; Norway, 100; Sweden, 200.
 3 Exclusive of following number of estimated issuances to immediate relatives (nonquota): Great Britain, 2,500; Germany, 6,500; Belgium, 200; Czechoslovakia, 100; Ireland, 400; Norway, 100; Sweden, 200.

23568

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 20, 1965

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, H.R. 2580 is a product of many years of study, analysis, and consideration. Many Senators, Congressmen, scholars, and organizations have contributed to this effort.

Perhaps no organization has made a more significant contribution than the American Immigration and Citizenship Conference, representing more than 90 ethnic organizations across the country concerned with immigration reform—an organization so ably led by a very distinguished American, Mrs. Ruth Zellerbach Murphy. The AICC and Mrs. Murphy deserve high commendation for their many years of tireless work in this field.

Because of the dedicated work of organizations such as the AICC and citizens such as Mrs. Murphy, we now have before us H.R. 2580, which is without a doubt a very meritorious measure.

Mr. President, opposition to revising our immigration statutes are based on two arguments: First, the fear that the admission of more immigrants to the country would exhaust our economic resources and add to our already serious employment problems; and, second, the fear that too many persons of Oriental background would be admitted into the country, upsetting traditional patterns of American life. Reasonable analysis of both arguments, however, shows them to be quite unfounded.

Let us analyze each of these in turn.

IMPACT ON THE ECONOMY

First, let us look at the impact of immigration on our economy. We have not introduced immigration reform legislation without thoughtful and thorough consideration of our economic situation and the hard facts about our complex technologically oriented economy. It is our belief that the immigration program proposed by our bill would enhance our economic growth, help stimulate our economy, and generate new employment opportunities. The best data unquestionably supports this assertion.

Based on statistics and facts supplied by the Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training, and the Technical Committee on Critical Occupations, both of the U.S. Department of Labor; the Bureau of the Census, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Justice Department, six points stand out with respect to the impact of immigration on our economy.

ANNUAL CEILING

First, under H.R. 2580 total annual immigration to the United States is limited to 170,000, plus perhaps 180,000 nonquota admissions a year, totaling 350,000, a figure which is only about 50,000 more than the number we actually have been admitting over the past 10 to 15 years. See tables 6, 6A-6E, 7, and 7A, Immigration and Naturalization Service Annual Report, 1964, pages 23 to 32. See also Population Bulletin, November 1962, page 137. This somewhat startling situation can be accounted for by the fact that Congress, recognizing the inadequacy of our present immigration laws, has repeatedly passed special short-term immigration and refugee legislation—the cumulative effect of which has so modified our immigration practice that the act of 1952 no longer

represents our immigration quota policy.

Of the 1½ million quota immigrants authorized during the fifties, only a million actually entered the United States. But 1½ million nonquota immigrants were admitted during the same period. In short, out of a total immigration of 2½ million, 3 out of 5 persons were admitted outside the quota provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

Congress, through special laws enacted every year since 1952, and through thousands of private immigration bills, has drastically revised the pattern of immigration envisioned by the act of 1952. Nations with very small quotas have been among the most substantial contributors to recent immigration. Italian immigration, for example, has been three times

greater than its quota allotment. Japanese immigration has been over 20 times greater. Immigration from Greece and China has been 16 times the very small number permitted by their quotas.

IMMIGRATION A DECLINING POPULATION FACTOR

The second noteworthy fact is that immigration has been a sharply declining factor in the increase of U.S. population. In the last 30 years immigration has accounted for an average of 5.1 percent of our population increase.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD table I, showing the components of U.S. population growth from 1870 to 1960.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—Components of U.S. population growth, 1870-1960

[In thousands]

Period	Population			Natural increase		Net immigration	
	Beginning of period	End of period	Increment	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1870-80	39,818	50,156	10,337	8,063	78.0	2,274	22.0
1880-90	50,116	62,948	12,794	8,302	64.9	4,490	35.1
1890-1900	62,948	75,995	13,047	10,516	80.6	2,531	19.4
1900-10	75,995	91,972	15,978	10,689	66.9	5,289	33.1
1910-20	91,972	105,711	13,738	10,537	76.7	3,201	23.3
1920-30	105,711	122,775	17,064	13,974	81.9	3,089	18.1
1930-40	122,775	131,669	8,894	8,787	98.8	1,067	1.2
1940-50	131,669	150,697	19,028	18,163	95.4	875	4.6
1950-60	151,323	179,323	27,997	25,337	90.5	2,660	9.5

¹ Excludes Alaska and Hawaii.

² Includes Alaska and Hawaii.

Source: Population Bulletin, November 1962.

Mr. FONG. Table I shows how immigration has been a declining proportion in the growth of our population.

In earlier decades, immigration ranged between 18 and 35 percent of our population growth. But in the 30 years since 1930, the comparable rates were 1.2 percent between 1930 and 1940, 4.6 percent between 1940 and 1950, and 9.5 percent between 1950 and 1960—an average of 5 percent over the 30-year span.

SMALL FRACTION OF WORK FORCE

Third, the number of immigrant work-

ers entering the United States in any single year during the postwar period represented a very small fraction of the total work force.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD table II showing immigrants with occupations as a percent of employed labor force for the years 1957 and 1961.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE II.—Immigrants with occupations as a percent of employed labor force, selected year

Occupational group	1961			1957		
	Labor force ¹ (thousands)	Immigrants ²	Immigrants as percent of occupation	Labor force ¹ (thousands)	Immigrants ²	Immigrants as percent of occupation
Total with occupation	66,796	123,688	0.19	65,016	152,986	0.24
Professional, technical, and kindred workers	7,705	21,455	.28	6,468	24,489	.38
Farmers and farm managers	2,711	3,002	.11	3,329	3,506	.11
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm	7,119	5,363	.08	6,703	6,127	.09
Clerical, sales, and kindred workers	14,300	25,198	.18	13,280	25,897	.20
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	8,623	17,679	.21	8,664	26,676	.31
Operatives and kindred workers	11,762	13,298	.11	12,630	19,362	.15
Private household workers	2,317	8,811	.38	2,098	11,457	.55
Service workers, except private household	6,323	8,399	.13	5,534	8,761	.16
Farm laborers and foremen	2,459	4,799	.20	2,730	4,585	.17
Laborers, except farm and mine	3,477	15,694	.45	3,680	21,826	.59

¹ Labor force figures are monthly averages for 1961 and quarterly averages for 1957.

² Data are for fiscal years.

Source: Labor force data—1961, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Employment and Earnings"; 1957, U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Annual Report on the Labor Force." Immigration data: Annual reports of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice.

September 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23569

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, this data is taken from the U.S. Census Bureau's population bulletin of November 1962.

Table II shows that in 1961, for example, our total labor force was about 66.7 million, including 123,688 immigrants—so that immigrants were less than one-fifth of 1 percent of our labor force. In that year this proportion did not exceed one-half of 1 percent in any occupational category ranging from the professional and technical workers to clerical, operatives, and unskilled laborers.

This data comes from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the U.S. Bureau of the Census, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Between 1947 and 1962, our labor force expanded by about 13 million persons, while the total number of immigrants was only 3.8 million. But not all of these immigrants could or did enter our labor force. About 20 percent were housewives, 20 percent were children under 14 years old, and 7 percent were students.

Thus, in any single year, only about 50 percent of the immigrants who came

to this country could have entered our labor force—for instance, in 1962 about 142,000 of the 284,000 immigrants, or less than a quarter of 1 percent of our employed labor force, could have entered our labor force.

It is anticipated that the numbers of immigrants entering the U.S. labor force under the pending bill would be a very small increase over present levels.

Average annual number of quota immigrants actually entering the United States between 1958 and 1962 was 97,500. The annual quota under H.R. 2580 would be 170,000, so that the yearly increase of actual quota immigrants would be 72,500.

Of this 72,500, 60 percent are expected to be housewives, children and others with no occupation (students, aged). Thus, 40 percent—only 29,000 additional persons—will enter the work force annually.

At present about 48,600 quota immigrants enter the labor force. Adding 29,000 to this 48,600, a total of only 77,600 quota immigrants would enter yearly under H.R. 2580.

Against a projected labor force in 1970 of 86 million, the number of quota immigrants entering the labor force annually under H.R. 2580 is only nine one-hundredths of 1 percent.

MOST IMMIGRANTS ARE PROFESSIONAL AND SKILLED

Although their numbers are small, these immigrants have made important contributions to our economy and society. Before they arrived, they had been fully trained and possessed talents and skills urgently needed in our economy. One of our most serious occupational shortages has been a lack of engineers. During the last 10 years, some 31,000 immigrant engineers entered the United States, which was only 5.6 percent of all domestic graduates in engineering and science.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that table III, showing the relationship between totals of immigrant scientists and engineers and domestic graduates in engineering and science, by fiscal year 1951 to 1961, be printed at this point in the Record, as follows:

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TABLE III.—Relationship between totals of immigrant scientists and engineers and domestic graduates in engineering and science, by fiscal years, 1951-61

Group	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961
1. Immigrant scientists and engineers.....	1,561	3,204	2,718	3,200	2,862	3,790	5,823	5,100	5,081	4,326	3,922
2. Domestic graduates in engineering and science ¹	93,793	72,646	60,834	57,883	57,066	62,634	71,594	79,677	86,474	89,443	93,000
Percentage of group 1 to group 2.....	1.7	4.4	4.5	5.5	5.0	6.1	8.1	6.5	5.9	4.8	4.2

¹ Includes earned bachelor's degrees in the natural sciences and engineering. Social sciences are excluded.

² Estimated.

Source: "Scientific Manpower From Abroad," by National Science Foundation, 1962.

Mr. FONG. Table III shows that, for example, in 1960, 4,326 immigrant scientists and engineers entered the United States compared with 89,443 domestic graduates in those fields, or a percentage of 4.8.

In 1961, 3,922 immigrant scientists and engineers entered the United States, compared with 93,000 domestic graduates in those fields, or a percentage of 4.2.

This data is taken from the publication "Scientific Manpower From Abroad," by the National Science Foundation, 1962.

We are all aware that there is a great need for engineers and scientists, and that we are able to employ many, many more. This sharply accelerated demand for engineers, paralleling steeply in-

creased demands for scientific and technical personnel, is attributed to increases in research activities, defense spending, and a speedup in industrial technological advances. These trends are expected to continue—see Manpower Research Bulletin, August 10, 1962; Scientific Manpower From Abroad, National Science Foundation, 1962; "Current Labor Market Conditions in Engineering, Scientific, and Technical Occupations," Department of Labor, August 1962.

UNEMPLOYMENT MOSTLY UNSKILLED WORKERS

The range of our unemployment in the last 10 years has been between 4 and 5 million jobless persons, who comprised 5.5 to 6 percent of the labor force, according to Labor Department figures—

see Manpower Report, March 1963, pages 33 to 38.

However, high unemployment rates in this country are not to be found among professional and technical workers, where it was 1.7 percent in 1964. Highest unemployment was concentrated in the relatively unskilled groups—the non-farm laborers, operatives, and service workers—which had rates well in excess of the 1962 total.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that table IV, showing unemployment rates of the unemployed, by major occupation groups, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

29570

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 20, 1965

TABLE IV.—Unemployment rates and percent distribution of the unemployed, by major occupation group—Annual averages,¹ 1947–64

[Persons 14 years of age and over]

Year	Total unemployed	Experienced workers											Persons with no previous work experience ¹
		Professional, technical, and kindred workers	Farmers and farm managers	Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm	Clerical and kindred workers	Sales workers	Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	Operatives and kindred workers	Private household workers	Service workers, except private household	Farm laborers and foremen	Laborers, except farm and mine	
Unemployment rate													
1947	3.6	1.9	.2	1.2	2.9	2.6	3.8	5.1	3.4	4.7	2.7	7.5	
1948	3.4	1.7	.2	1.0	2.3	3.4	2.9	4.1	3.2	4.8	2.3	7.5	
1949	5.5	1.9	.2	1.5	3.8	3.5	5.9	8.0	5.2	6.1	3.9	12.9	
1950	5.0	2.2	.3	1.6	3.4	4.0	5.6	6.8	5.6	6.8	5.0	11.7	
1951	3.0	1.5	.3	1.0	2.1	2.8	2.6	4.3	3.8	4.3	2.1	5.6	
1952	2.7	1.0	.2	.7	1.8	2.5	2.4	3.9	3.2	3.7	2.3	5.7	
1953	2.5	.9	.2	.9	1.7	2.1	2.6	3.2	2.5	3.6	2.5	6.1	
1954	5.0	1.6	.4	1.2	3.1	3.7	4.9	7.6	5.0	5.2	4.2	10.7	
1955	4.0	1.0	.4	.9	2.6	2.4	4.0	5.7	4.1	5.8	3.7	10.2	
1956	3.8	1.0	.4	.8	2.4	2.7	3.2	5.4	4.2	4.8	3.7	8.2	
1957	4.3	1.2	.3	1.0	2.8	2.6	3.8	6.3	3.7	5.1	3.7	9.4	
1958	6.8	2.0	.6	1.7	4.4	4.0	6.8	10.9	5.2	7.4	6.2	14.9	
1959	5.5	1.7	.3	1.3	3.7	3.7	5.3	7.6	4.8	6.4	5.1	12.4	
1960	5.6	1.7	.3	1.4	3.8	3.7	5.3	8.0	4.9	6.0	5.2	12.5	
1961	6.7	2.0	.4	1.8	4.6	4.7	6.3	9.6	5.9	7.4	5.7	14.5	
1962	5.6	1.7	.3	1.5	3.9	4.1	5.1	7.5	4.9	6.4	4.3	13.4	
1963	5.7	1.8	.5	1.5	4.0	4.2	4.8	7.4	5.2	6.2	5.5	12.1	
1964	5.2	1.7	.5	1.4	3.7	3.4	4.2	6.5	4.9	6.1	5.8	10.6	
Percent distribution													
1947	100.0	3.2	.4	3.1	9.5	4.0	13.5	28.9	2.6	9.1	3.8	12.5	9.4
1948	100.0	3.4	.4	3.3	8.6	4.3	12.0	26.0	2.9	10.7	3.8	14.0	8.8
1949	100.0	2.3	.3	2.9	8.8	4.0	14.4	30.5	2.9	8.8	3.8	14.6	6.6
1950	100.0	3.1	.5	3.2	8.2	4.9	13.8	26.9	3.4	10.3	4.8	14.2	6.8
1951	100.0	3.8	.6	3.2	8.7	4.7	11.5	29.1	3.8	10.9	3.2	12.2	7.3
1952	100.0	3.1	.5	2.4	8.5	4.4	12.5	23.8	3.4	10.4	3.6	13.1	8.3
1953	100.0	3.0	.6	3.8	8.5	4.2	14.5	26.5	3.0	12.0	3.8	14.8	4.4
1954	100.0	2.8	.5	2.5	8.2	4.8	13.5	32.1	2.9	8.7	3.4	13.7	7.0
1955	100.0	2.2	.5	2.2	8.0	4.6	12.8	28.2	3.1	11.7	4.0	15.3	8.4
1956	100.0	2.4	.5	2.0	8.6	4.5	11.3	23.5	3.6	10.9	4.4	12.8	10.4
1957	100.0	2.7	.3	2.3	9.2	4.8	12.0	29.4	2.8	10.2	3.7	13.3	10.3
1958	100.0	2.9	.4	2.6	9.0	4.7	13.2	30.0	2.6	9.5	3.5	13.5	9.3
1959	100.0	3.2	.2	2.4	9.3	4.4	12.5	25.5	2.9	10.5	3.6	13.9	11.6
1960	100.0	3.4	.2	2.5	9.8	4.2	12.1	26.5	2.9	9.9	3.6	13.3	11.6
1961	100.0	3.3	.2	2.8	9.9	4.6	12.1	26.0	3.0	10.5	3.1	12.2	12.2
1962	100.0	3.5	.2	2.8	10.4	4.6	11.5	24.4	3.0	11.1	2.6	12.5	13.4
1963	100.0	3.7	.3	2.6	10.4	4.5	10.9	24.1	3.0	10.8	3.1	11.8	14.8
1964	100.0	3.9	.3	2.7	10.6	4.0	10.1	23.3	3.1	11.6	3.4	11.0	16.0

¹ See footnote 1, table A-10.² Unemployed persons who never held a full-time civilian job.³ See footnote 1, table A-1.⁴ Data through 1956 have not been adjusted to reflect changes in the definitions of employment and unemployment adopted in January 1957. See footnote 2, table A-1.

Source: "President's 1965 Manpower Report."

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, table IV shows that higher unemployment rates continued to be found among blue-collar workers and among the less skilled in 1964. While the total unemployment rate was 5.2 percent of the work force, unemployed unskilled nonfarm laborers to those employed in that group was 10.6 percent; blue-collar operatives 6.5 percent; and service workers, 6.1 percent. The unemployed rate for professional and technical occupations was only 1.7 percent.

The source of this data is the 1965 President's Manpower Report.

Since only an extremely small number of immigrants who are unskilled workers

are admitted annually, immigration has only a minimal effect, if at all, on unemployment.

PRODUCTIVITY FACTORS

Although our knowledge of the causes underlying the rising trend of unemployment is as yet imperfect, it has been increasingly clear that labor has been displaced largely by advances in technology and the striking gains in man-hour productivity.

It has been estimated that about 1.8 million jobs are affected each year by technological change, and that approximately 18 million jobs will be affected in the decade 1960–70—see population bulletin, November 1962, page 144.

Output per man-hour in private industry since 1947 has increased at an annual average rate of 3.2 percent, and these gains, rather than increases in man-hours of work, account for more than 80 percent of the growth of total output since 1947—see table V below. See also the Manpower Reports, March 1965, page 256, and March 1963, pages 67 to 72.

I ask unanimous consent that table V showing "Indexes of Output Per Man-Hour and Related Data: Annual Averages, 1947–64" may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TABLE V.—Indexes of output¹ per man-hour and related data: Annual averages, 1947-64

[1957-5=100]

Output, employment, and man-hours	1964 ²	1963	1962	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956	1955	1954 ³	1953	1952	1951	1950	1949	1948	1947
Man-hour estimates based primarily on establishment data ⁴																		
OUTPUT PER MAN-HOUR																		
Total private.....	120.5	117.0	113.8	108.9	105.2	103.2	99.6	97.2	93.9	93.8	89.8	88.2	84.7	82.9	80.9	75.5	73.4	7.9
Agriculture.....	134.4	130.3	119.1	116.3	109.3	102.8	103.0	94.2	88.3	86.4	83.4	77.8	86.9	64.0	64.7	56.8	59.6	50.2
Nonagricultural industries.....	118.3	115.0	112.6	107.8	104.6	103.0	99.4	97.6	94.9	95.3	91.4	90.0	87.6	86.5	85.1	80.8	77.9	76.3
Manufacturing.....	119.7	115.4	112.6	106.7	103.8	103.3	99.1	97.8	95.1	96.8	90.9	89.5	88.2	87.1	85.1	81.8	78.2	75.1
Nonmanufacturing.....	117.7	115.1	112.5	108.5	105.1	102.8	99.7	97.5	94.6	94.3	91.4	90.0	87.1	86.0	84.9	80.5	77.5	75.1
HOURS PER UNIT OF OUTPUT																		
Total private.....	83.0	85.5	87.9	91.8	95.0	96.9	100.4	102.8	106.5	106.6	111.4	113.4	118.0	120.6	123.7	132.5	136.2	141.1
Agriculture.....	74.4	76.7	84.0	86.0	91.5	97.3	97.1	106.2	113.2	115.7	119.9	128.6	143.1	156.3	154.5	175.9	167.9	199.3
Nonagricultural industries.....	84.5	87.0	88.8	92.7	95.6	97.1	100.6	102.4	105.4	105.0	109.4	111.1	114.1	115.5	117.5	123.8	128.4	131.0
Manufacturing.....	83.5	86.7	88.8	93.7	96.4	96.8	101.0	102.3	105.2	103.3	110.0	111.8	113.4	114.8	117.5	122.3	127.9	133.2
Nonmanufacturing.....	84.9	86.9	88.9	92.2	95.2	97.3	100.8	102.6	105.7	106.0	109.4	111.1	114.8	116.2	117.8	124.3	129.1	130.2
OUTPUT																		
Total private.....	126.6	119.8	115.7	108.7	106.8	104.1	97.0	98.9	97.0	95.0	87.2	88.6	84.4	82.0	77.3	70.8	71.2	68.4
Agriculture.....	108.2	108.7	104.8	104.8	104.8	100.0	100.5	99.0	100.5	102.9	97.6	93.7	90.4	87.0	82.8	88.0	92.8	81.2
Nonagricultural industries.....	126.6	120.4	116.4	108.9	106.9	104.3	96.8	98.9	96.8	94.5	86.6	88.3	84.1	81.7	78.4	69.8	70.0	67.7
Manufacturing.....	126.3	119.2	115.2	104.8	104.8	104.6	94.2	101.2	100.0	100.3	89.2	96.1	90.2	87.6	79.6	70.4	73.9	71.4
Nonmanufacturing.....	126.8	121.1	116.9	110.9	107.9	104.1	98.0	97.9	95.3	91.8	85.3	84.6	81.2	78.9	74.9	59.6	68.1	65.9
EMPLOYMENT																		
Total private.....	105.5	103.5	102.7	101.0	101.9	100.8	97.9	101.3	101.5	98.9	95.2	97.6	96.2	95.2	91.9	90.2	92.1	90.9
Agriculture.....	80.9	84.0	87.9	91.2	95.6	97.0	97.9	104.5	110.5	113.2	109.6	110.8	120.5	125.3	133.5	142.1	140.4	145.0
Nonagricultural industries.....	103.1	105.6	104.2	102.1	102.6	101.1	97.9	101.0	100.5	97.4	83.7	96.1	93.6	92.0	87.5	84.7	87.0	85.2
Manufacturing.....	104.2	102.5	101.6	98.4	101.2	100.3	96.2	103.5	103.9	101.8	95.4	105.8	100.4	98.9	92.0	87.2	94.0	93.8
Nonmanufacturing.....	109.8	107.0	105.4	103.7	103.2	101.4	98.7	99.9	99.0	95.5	91.6	91.9	90.6	89.0	85.5	83.6	83.9	81.4
MAN-HOURS																		
Total private.....	104.2	102.4	101.7	99.8	101.5	100.9	97.4	101.7	103.3	101.3	97.1	100.5	99.6	98.9	95.6	93.8	97.0	96.5
Agriculture.....	80.5	83.4	88.0	90.1	95.9	97.3	97.6	105.1	113.8	119.1	117.0	120.5	129.4	136.0	143.4	154.8	155.8	181.8
Nonagricultural industries.....	107.0	104.7	103.4	101.0	102.2	101.3	97.4	101.3	102.0	99.2	94.7	98.1	96.0	94.4	88.8	86.4	89.0	88.7
Manufacturing.....	105.5	103.3	102.3	98.2	101.0	101.3	95.1	103.5	105.2	103.6	98.1	107.4	102.3	100.6	93.5	86.1	94.5	95.1
Nonmanufacturing.....	107.7	105.2	103.9	102.2	102.7	101.3	98.3	100.4	100.7	97.3	93.3	94.0	93.2	91.7	88.2	86.5	87.9	85.8
Man-hour estimates based primarily on labor force data ⁵																		
OUTPUT PER MAN-HOUR																		
Total private.....	118.8	115.5	112.4	107.5	104.8	103.4	99.1	97.5	94.4	94.1	89.7	87.5	83.7	81.1	77.5	72.0	70.6	68.5
Agriculture.....	134.9	130.6	119.4	116.8	109.3	102.7	103.1	94.2	87.8	85.9	83.0	77.3	69.4	63.6	64.5	56.4	59.6	50.2
Nonagricultural industries.....	116.1	113.2	111.1	106.1	104.1	103.2	98.8	98.0	95.7	95.8	91.5	89.5	86.7	84.7	81.4	76.9	74.5	73.8
HOURS PER UNIT OF OUTPUT																		
Total private.....	84.2	86.6	88.9	93.0	95.4	96.7	100.9	102.5	105.9	106.3	111.5	114.3	119.4	123.3	129.0	138.8	141.7	145.9
Agriculture.....	74.1	76.5	83.8	85.6	91.5	97.4	97.0	106.2	113.9	116.4	120.5	129.3	144.0	157.2	155.1	177.4	167.7	199.3
Nonagricultural industries.....	86.1	88.4	90.0	94.2	96.1	96.9	101.2	102.0	104.5	104.3	109.2	111.8	115.3	118.1	122.9	130.1	134.1	135.5
OUTPUT																		
Total private.....	125.6	119.8	115.7	108.7	106.8	104.1	97.0	98.9	97.0	95.0	87.2	88.6	84.4	82.0	77.3	70.8	71.2	68.4
Agriculture.....	108.2	108.7	104.8	104.8	104.8	100.0	100.5	99.0	100.5	102.9	97.6	93.7	90.4	87.0	82.8	88.0	92.8	81.2
Nonagricultural industries.....	126.6	120.4	116.4	108.9	106.9	104.3	96.8	98.9	96.8	94.5	86.6	88.3	84.1	81.7	76.4	69.8	70.0	67.7
EMPLOYMENT																		
Total private.....	107.0	104.8	103.5	102.0	102.2	100.9	98.4	100.7	100.6	98.1	94.9	97.0	96.2	96.2	95.1	93.0	94.5	92.4
Agriculture.....	80.9	84.0	87.9	91.2	95.6	97.6	97.9	104.5	110.5	113.2	109.6	110.8	120.5	125.3	133.5	142.1	140.4	145.0
Nonagricultural industries.....	109.9	107.1	105.3	103.3	103.0	101.2	98.5	100.3	99.4	96.3	93.3	95.4	93.4	92.8	90.7	87.4	89.2	86.4
MAN-HOURS																		
Total private.....	105.7	103.7	102.9	101.1	101.9	100.7	97.9	101.4	102.7	101.0	97.2	101.3	100.8	101.1	99.7	98.3	100.9	99.8
Agriculture.....	80.2	83.2	87.8	89.7	95.9	97.4	97.5	105.1	114.5	119.8	117.6	121.2	130.2	136.8	143.9	156.1	155.6	161.8
Nonagricultural industries.....	109.0	106.4	104.8	102.6	102.7	101.1	98.0	100.9	101.2	98.6	94.6	98.7	97.0	96.5	93.9	90.8	93.9	91.7

¹ Output refers to gross national product in 1954 dollars.

² Preliminary.

³ The estimates based on establishment data are derived principally from employment and hours obtained from monthly payroll reports submitted by establishments. The estimates based on labor force data use primarily employment and hours from the

monthly labor force survey of households. Data for years prior to 1964 have been revised for several series, particularly for manufacturing and nonmanufacturing.

Source: "President's 1965 Manpower Report."

September 20, 1965

23572

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, table V shows the close, positive relationship between productivity increases and expanding output; as output per man-hour showed impressive gains, output—as measured by gross private product in 1947 dollars—rose at about the same impressive rate. At the same time while output rose by about 59 percent, employment rose only by 11 percent. Total man-hours worked rose by even less—only about 3 percent.

So that well over 80 percent of the increase in aggregate output from 1947 onward can be explained by increases in output per man-hour.

These data come from the President's 1965 and 1963 Manpower Reports.

The technological innovations of the past 15 years have also created employment opportunities, but the jobs which they have produced demand skills and a degree of sophistication that cannot be supplied by the traditional blue-collar worker with a limited education. Yet, 7.5 million out of the 26 million young people entering the labor force between 1960 and 1970—or some 29 percent—will lack high school diplomas—see Manpower Research Bulletin, Department of Labor, March 1963, pages 9 and 10. There is no doubt that one of the major causes of unemployment is the rapid technological changes in our economy.

Unemployment, then, does not always mean that there is a job shortage. It may also indicate a shortage of persons who have the kinds of skills, knowledge and abilities required by the economy. Labor economists in the United States are discovering that it is possible for large numbers of unemployed to exist, even while innumerable job openings go unfilled. To quote from the Labor Department's 1963 Manpower Report:

Despite the large supply of unused manpower, serious shortages exist in essential occupations Jobs remain unfilled because they require different skills from those possessed by the unemployed. Moreover—

The report continues—extending market mechanisms and educational programs have not overcome the imbalance of requirements and resources.

Shortages of qualified workers are particularly acute in the scientific, engineering, teaching, technical, health, and other professional fields—see the President's Manpower Report, March 1963, pages 30 to 32; and, as the Manpower Report points out, these ordinarily are not occupations toward which unemployed workers can be directed. To meet these shortages, extensive education and training are required; retraining and reeducation of our existing manpower resources cannot be accomplished except over a prolonged period of time.

IMMIGRATION A SOURCE OF SKILLED LABOR

Where, then, are these highly trained and skilled workers to come from? One important source has been immigration.

These immigrants, according to Labor Department officials, have not increased the number of persons on our unemployment rolls, because they possessed the skills and training our economy required. Even if it were possible immediately to retrain and reeducate 150,000 to 200,000 unemployed persons—a relatively small proportion—to give them skills needed by the economy, there can be no doubt that the economy would be significantly stimulated.

Precisely the same thing may be said about the entry of skilled and highly trained immigrants into the economy. Of all immigrant workers arriving since 1947, about one of every three reported a professional, technical, or skilled occupation. Approximately half of the

three and a half million immigrants who entered the United States between 1947 and 1961 were reported as having occupational attachments—see table VI—the remainder were primarily housewives, and young and retired persons.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tables VI and VII be received and made a part of the Record. Table VI shows the number and percentage distribution of immigrants by broad occupational groups for 1947-64 and for selected years. Table VII shows the number of immigrants in selected critical occupations admitted each year, 1952-64.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TABLE VI.—Number and percent distribution of immigrants, by broad occupational groups, for fiscal years 1947-64 and for selected years

Occupational groups	Total 1947 through 1964		1964		1954		1947	
	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent
Total admitted.....	4,424,460	100.0	202,248	100.0	208,177	100.0	147,292	100.0
With occupation.....	2,077,594	47.0	131,098	44.9	96,110	46.2	65,583	44.5
No occupation.....	2,346,866	53.0	151,076	51.7	112,067	53.8	81,709	55.5
No occupation reported.....	(1)		10,074	3.4	(1)		(1)	
With occupation ²	2,077,594	100.0	131,098	100.0	96,110	100.0	65,583	100.0
Professional, technical, and kindred workers.....	343,414	16.5	28,756	21.9	13,817	14.4	10,891	16.6
Farmers and farm managers.....	92,180	4.4	1,732	1.3	3,846	4.0	3,492	5.3
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm.....	101,708	4.9	6,822	5.2	5,296	5.5	5,886	9.0
Clerical, sales, and kindred workers.....	387,845	17.7	30,015	22.9	16,018	16.7	13,961	21.3
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers.....	321,453	15.5	17,568	13.4	15,396	16.0	8,726	13.3
Operatives and kindred workers.....	279,646	13.5	14,243	10.9	16,755	17.4	10,580	16.1
Private household workers.....	157,306	7.6	8,451	6.4	8,096	8.4	4,922	7.5
Service workers, except private household.....	125,053	6.0	10,398	7.9	5,203	5.4	3,882	5.9
Farm laborers and foremen.....	78,044	3.8	3,988	3.0	1,822	1.7	442	.7
Laborers, except farm and mine.....	210,945	10.2	9,127	7.0	10,061	10.5	2,831	4.3

¹ "No occupation" includes "No occupation reported" group.

² Includes immigrants 14 years of age and over.

NOTE.—Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

Source: Annual Reports of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice.

TABLE VII.—Number of immigrants in selected critical occupations admitted each year fiscal years 1954-64 ¹

	Total, 1954-64	1964	1963	1962	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956	1955	1954
Biological scientists.....	601	112	81	49	48	53	57	56	51	35	36	23
Chemists.....	6,335	825	814	474	551	504	645	626	668	494	351	383
Dentists.....	1,429	160	177	115	119	110	99	129	132	159	113	116
Engineers.....	26,461	3,660	3,965	2,009	2,868	3,338	3,936	4,008	4,524	2,794	2,067	2,391
Geologists and geophysicists.....	669	85	73	88	66	42	59	58	62	51	41	34
Mathematicians.....	345	50	56	39	31	29	32	35	32	17	18	14
Nurses.....	16,853	4,230	4,355	3,700	3,440	3,828	3,820	3,729	3,517	3,064	1,864	1,502
Physicians and surgeons.....	18,424	2,249	2,093	1,797	1,683	1,574	1,630	1,934	1,990	1,388	1,046	1,040
Physicists.....	1,610	242	216	187	151	162	155	145	128	75	75	74
Professors and instructors.....	4,797	839	761	589	500	367	340	352	372	290	173	184
Teachers not specified.....	27,218	4,086	3,727	3,182	2,686	2,532	2,670	2,471	2,304	1,655	1,549	1,355
Technicians.....	7,239	2,448	2,197	1,838	1,635	1,632	1,821	1,346	1,553	1,095	840	804
Machinists.....	19,252	969	897	681	819	993	1,476	836	1,393	1,106	594	488
Toolmakers, diemakers and setters.....	7,334	423	473	369	460	706	654	858	1,150	894	587	760

¹ The occupational categories listed in this table are those which immigrants reported on their arrival in the United States. It was not possible, in a few instances, because of lack of sufficient occupational detail to make a precise match with the occupations which appear on the "List of Currently Critical Occupations" as determined by the Technical Committee on Critical Occupations of the U.S. Department of Labor. For this reason, totals are not shown.

Source: 1959 through 1964: Annual reports of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice; 1954 through 1958: Data furnished by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice.

September 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23573

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, some 14,000 immigrant physicians and surgeons, and about 28,000 nurses helped alleviate the shortage of trained persons in the critical medical field in the 1952-61 periods; about 4,900 chemists, 1,100 physicists, and over 12,000 technicians—vitaly needed workers who support scientists and engineers—were admitted in that same period.

This data was gathered from the annual reports of the Immigration and Naturalization Service for the years 1952-61.

Between 1953 and 1961, over 166,000 immigrants entering this country possessed skills in such critical job areas as physics, nursing, medicine, teaching, engineering, and other kindred fields. These were occupations declared to be in short supply by the Technical Committee on Critical Occupations of the Labor Department, occupations which are used by the Selective Service in determining deferments in the national interest.

Some 12,680 immigrant physicians and surgeons, and about 25,376 nurses helped alleviate the shortage of trained persons in the critical medical field in the 1952-61 period; about 4,448 chemists, 4,036 natural scientists, and 19,894 technicians—vitaly needed workers who support scientists and engineers—were admitted in that same period.

Typical nonagricultural occupations now certified to be in short supply by the Labor Department are librarians, dietitians, laboratory technicians, physical therapists, systems engineers, cabinet-makers, machinists, draftsmen, and tailors.

I ask unanimous consent to submit and have printed in the Record table VIII, showing the selected professional, technical, and kindred workers admitted to the United States, 1959-61, and total, January 1, 1953, to June 30, 1961.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TABLE VIII.—Selected professional, technical, and kindred workers admitted to the United States, 1959-61, and total Jan. 1, 1953, to June 30, 1961

	1961		1960		1959		Jan. 1, 1953, to June 30, 1961	
	Total	Percent of PTK's ¹	Total	Percent of PTK's ¹	Total	Percent of PTK's ¹	Total	Percent of PTK's ¹
Total.....	21,453	100.0	21,940	100.0	23,287	100.0	166,413	100.0
Engineers.....	2,868	13.4	3,338	15.2	3,936	16.9	27,142	16.3
Natural scientists.....	376	1.7	401	1.8	428	1.8	5,036	2.4
Physicists.....	151	.7	162	.7	155	.7
Mathematicians.....	24	.1	31	.1	29	.1
Other natural scientists.....	201	.9	208	1.0	244	1.0
Chemists.....	551	2.6	504	2.3	645	2.8	4,448	2.7
Physicians and surgeons.....	1,683	7.8	1,574	7.2	1,630	7.0	12,680	7.6
Dentists.....	119	.6	110	.5	99	.4
Nurses.....	3,449	16.1	3,828	17.4	3,620	15.5	25,376	15.2
College professors and instructors.....	500	2.3	367	1.7	340	1.5	1,921	1.2
Teachers (not specified).....	2,688	12.5	2,532	11.6	2,670	11.5	17,998	10.8
Technicians ²	2,138	10.0	2,350	10.7	2,740	11.8	19,894	12.0
Other professional, technical, and kindred workers.....	7,085	33.0	6,936	31.6	7,179	30.8	52,918	31.8

¹ Professional, technical, and kindred workers.

² Includes draftsmen.

³ Includes designers, draftsmen, radio operators, surveyors, medical and dental technicians, testing technicians, and technicians not specified.

Source: Annual reports of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FONG. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Is it the impression of the Senator from Hawaii that specific shortages in our labor market could be readily filled today by those who have the skills described by the Senator from Hawaii, and that they would not displace American workers or

affect the wages and working conditions of Americans in those particular fields? Is it not true that immigrants who would serve in those capacities would fill positions in our economy which need strengthening?

Mr. FONG. Yes; the Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Would not such immigration provide additional employment and benefits for

others who might be dependent upon such positions being filled?

Mr. FONG. If positions which require technical skills are not filled, the many jobs which support such technically skilled positions would also not be filled, and many new jobs would not be created. By bringing in technically equipped persons, jobs would be created for our own people. This is the point I am trying to make.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. A real benefit would accrue to our own economy, as the Senator has suggested, by providing job opportunities for Americans, because the vacancies which demand particular skills would be filled.

Mr. FONG. Yes. A report has been made which states that every person who obtains a Ph. D. degree supports at least 200 persons; that because of such a person's brainpower, skill, and know-how, at least 200 persons would be able to obtain work under him because of his Ph. D. degree.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I thank the Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, it is important to note here that the proportion of immigrants with a high degree of skill has increased significantly in the past decade—see tables VI and VII. For instance, there were 20 percent more engineers entering in 1961 than in 1952, and 84 percent more technicians. It should be noted further that special legislation was passed during the 87th Congress to permit nonquota admission of several thousand highly trained and skilled immigrants.

ECONOMY NEEDS SKILLED AND PROFESSIONAL WORKERS

Virtually every study projecting the occupational structure of our economy in the decade of the sixties shows a shift of employment toward occupations requiring high levels of skill, training and education. While unskilled jobs are not expected to expand at all in terms of absolute numbers, professional and technical positions will be the fastest growing occupations. This simply reflects the continuation of scientific and technological advances and of trends which were becoming increasingly evident as early as 1947.

I submit and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record table IX which shows employed persons by major occupation group, annual averages, 1947-62.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

23574

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 20, 1965

TABLE IX.—Employed persons by major occupation group; Annual averages, 1947-62, persons 14 years of age and over

Major occupation group and sex	Number (in thousands)															
	1962	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956	1955	1954	1953	1952	1951	1950	1949	1948	1947
BOTH SEXES																
Total employed	67,846	66,796	66,681	65,581	63,966	65,016	64,928	62,997	61,160	61,778	60,989	60,854	59,645	58,489	59,307	57,843
White-collar workers	29,901	29,124	28,726	27,798	27,056	26,451	25,597	24,585	23,891	23,614	23,070	22,413	22,373	21,636	21,400	20,185
Professional, technical, and kindred workers	8,040	7,705	7,475	7,143	6,961	6,468	6,096	5,792	5,588	5,448	5,092	4,788	4,490	4,028	3,977	3,795
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm	7,408	7,119	7,067	6,935	6,785	6,703	6,552	6,450	6,201	6,396	6,182	6,220	6,429	6,433	6,344	5,795
Clerical and kindred workers	10,107	9,861	9,783	9,326	9,137	9,152	8,838	8,367	8,168	7,991	8,122	7,655	7,632	7,438	7,438	7,209
Sales workers	4,346	4,439	4,401	4,394	4,173	4,128	4,111	3,976	3,934	3,779	3,674	3,750	3,822	3,737	3,641	3,395
Blue-collar workers	24,278	23,862	24,211	24,162	23,510	24,874	25,179	24,771	24,167	24,991	24,802	25,009	23,336	22,770	23,988	23,554
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	8,578	8,523	8,560	8,561	8,469	8,604	8,693	8,328	8,311	8,558	8,742	8,434	7,670	7,625	8,119	7,754
Operatives and kindred workers	12,041	11,762	11,986	11,858	11,441	12,520	12,816	12,762	12,253	12,747	12,352	12,623	12,146	11,790	12,396	12,274
Laborers, except farm and mine	3,559	3,477	3,665	3,743	3,600	3,680	3,670	3,681	3,603	3,656	3,707	3,952	3,520	3,365	3,573	3,526
Service workers	8,802	8,640	8,349	8,040	7,809	7,632	7,609	7,106	6,755	6,949	6,488	6,533	6,535	6,266	6,040	5,987
Private household workers	2,341	2,317	2,216	2,197	2,204	2,098	2,124	1,946	1,760	1,850	1,805	1,869	1,883	1,757	1,754	1,731
Service workers, except private household	6,461	6,323	6,133	5,843	5,605	5,534	5,485	5,160	4,995	5,099	4,683	4,664	4,652	4,509	4,286	4,256
Farmworkers	4,566	5,170	5,395	5,582	5,591	6,059	6,544	6,537	6,348	6,224	6,632	6,900	7,408	7,819	7,881	8,120
Farmers and farm managers	2,596	2,771	2,780	3,019	3,083	3,329	3,655	3,739	3,853	3,842	3,963	4,025	4,393	4,703	4,668	4,995
Farm laborers and foremen	2,271	2,459	2,615	2,563	2,508	2,730	2,889	2,798	2,495	2,382	2,669	2,875	3,015	3,116	3,213	3,125
Percent distribution																
Total employed	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
White-collar workers	44.1	43.6	43.1	42.4	42.3	40.6	39.4	39.0	39.0	38.2	37.7	36.8	37.5	37.0	36.1	34.9
Professional, technical, and kindred workers	11.9	11.5	11.2	10.9	10.9	9.9	9.4	9.2	9.1	8.8	8.3	7.9	7.5	6.9	6.7	6.6
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm	10.9	10.7	10.6	10.6	10.6	10.3	10.1	10.2	10.1	10.4	10.1	10.2	10.8	11.0	10.7	10.0
Clerical and kindred workers	14.9	14.8	14.7	14.2	14.3	14.1	13.6	13.3	13.4	12.9	13.3	12.6	12.8	12.7	12.5	12.4
Sales workers	6.4	6.6	6.6	6.7	6.5	6.3	6.3	6.4	6.4	6.1	6.0	6.2	6.4	6.4	6.1	5.9
Blue-collar workers	35.8	35.7	36.3	36.9	36.7	38.3	38.8	39.2	39.5	40.4	40.7	41.1	39.1	38.9	40.4	40.7
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	12.8	12.9	12.8	13.1	13.1	13.3	13.4	13.2	13.6	13.9	14.3	13.9	12.9	13.0	13.7	13.4
Operatives and kindred workers	17.7	17.6	18.0	18.1	17.9	19.3	19.7	20.2	20.0	20.6	20.3	20.7	20.3	20.1	20.9	21.2
Laborers, except farm and mine	5.2	5.2	5.5	5.7	5.6	5.7	5.7	5.8	6.9	5.9	6.1	6.5	5.9	5.8	5.9	6.1
Service workers	13.0	12.9	12.5	12.2	12.2	11.7	11.7	11.3	11.1	11.3	10.7	10.8	11.0	10.7	10.2	10.4
Private household workers	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.2	3.3	3.1	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.2	3.0	3.0	3.0
Service workers, except private household	9.5	9.5	9.2	8.9	8.8	8.5	8.4	8.2	8.2	8.3	7.7	7.7	7.8	7.7	7.2	7.4
Farmworkers	7.2	7.8	8.1	8.5	8.7	9.3	10.1	10.5	10.4	10.1	10.9	11.3	12.5	13.3	13.3	14.0
Farmers and farm managers	3.8	4.1	4.2	4.6	4.8	5.1	5.6	6.0	6.3	6.2	6.5	6.6	7.4	8.0	7.9	8.6
Farm laborers and foremen	3.3	3.7	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.2	4.5	4.5	4.1	3.9	4.4	4.7	5.1	5.3	5.4	5.4

EMPLOYMENT, BY MAJOR OCCUPATIONAL GROUP, 1960-75

Major occupational group	Actual, 1960		Projected, 1970		Projected, 1975		Percent change		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	1960-70	1970-75	1960-75
Total	Millions 69.7	100.0	Millions 80.5	100.0	Millions 87.6	100.0	21	9	31
Professional, technical, and kindred workers	7.5	11.2	10.7	13.3	12.4	14.2	43	16	65
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm	7.1	10.6	8.6	10.7	9.4	10.7	21	9	32
Clerical and kindred workers	9.8	14.7	12.3	15.3	14.2	16.2	31	11	45
Sales workers	4.4	6.6	5.4	6.7	5.9	6.7	23	9	34
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	8.6	12.8	10.3	12.8	11.2	12.8	20	9	30
Operatives and kindred workers	12.0	18.0	13.6	16.9	14.2	16.3	13	4	18
Service workers	8.3	12.5	11.1	13.8	12.6	14.3	34	13	51
Laborers, except farm and mine	3.7	5.5	3.7	4.6	3.7	4.3			
Farmers, farm managers, laborers, and foremen	5.4	8.1	4.2	5.3	3.9	4.5	-22	-7	-28

NOTE.—Individual items may not add to totals because of rounding.

Source: Monthly Labor Review, March 1963; President's 1963 Manpower Report.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, table VIII, which I have already introduced, shows selected professional, technical, and kindred workers admitted to the United States from 1959 to 1961 and the total number of such workers admitted between January 1, 1953, and June 30, 1961.

The total admitted in that 8-year period was 166,413, of which 21,455 were admitted in 1961, 21,940 in 1960, and 23,287 in 1959.

Table VIII relates directly to table IX, which shows employment by type of occupation between 1947 and 1962, and the percent change in employment projected to 1970.

Table IX shows that the demand for professional, technical, and other skilled workers is expected to continue to rise in the future. But unskilled occupation groups are not expected to grow at all; in fact, they may decline.

These materials are drawn from the Monthly Labor Review, March 1963, and the President's 1963 Manpower Report.

The large unfulfilled need for personnel in the professional, technical, and other skilled occupations is expected to continue into the foreseeable future. This fact was underscored particularly in the President's 1965 Manpower Report. Immigration will therefore continue to be our best source of supply of highly trained people.

Best estimates of the number of an-

ticipated immigrant workers annually entering the country under H.R. 2580 is that the professional, technical, craft and kindred workers will continue at relatively high levels, and that unskilled workers entering will continue at relatively low levels.

ECONOMIC VALUE OF EDUCATION

The fourth point is tied to the third—the fact that many American economists and social scientists are beginning to recognize the tremendous economic value of educated people. They see that much of the wealth attributable to resources and capital equipment really has its roots in education.

For example, a person born in 1956 who subsequently completes high school would earn a lifetime income of \$253,631, computed on the basis of the average income of male high school graduates in 1956. A substantial increase each additional year of schooling completed, so that, for instance, on the basis of 1958 data, a college graduate could expect to earn about \$435,000 during his lifetime, compared with \$258,000 for the high school graduate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD table X, which shows estimated lifetime income for males, by years of school completed, selected years.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE X.—Estimated lifetime income for males, by years of school completed, selected years

Years of school completed	Income from age 18 to death				Income from age 25 to 64			
	1939	1949	1956	1958	1939	1949	1956	1958
Elementary:								
Total.....	(1)	\$113,330	\$154,693	\$154,114	\$37,172	\$91,932	\$127,047	\$127,286
Less than 8 years.....	(1)	98,222	132,736	129,764	(1)	78,654	106,310	106,449
8 years.....	(1)	132,688	180,867	181,695	(1)	106,889	148,033	149,687
High school:								
1 to 3 years.....	(1)	152,068	205,277	211,193	53,011	121,943	169,501	176,779
4 years.....	(1)	185,279	253,631	257,557	67,383	148,649	208,322	216,487
College:								
1 to 3 years.....	(1)	209,282	291,581	315,504	73,655	173,166	243,611	269,105
4 years or more.....	(1)	296,277	405,698	435,242	104,608	241,427	340,131	366,990

¹ Not available.

Source: Occupational Outlook Quarterly, 1961.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FONG. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator has been referring to the quality of recent immigration to the United States. The Senator has had printed in the RECORD a number of tabulations which indicate the skills possessed by those immigrants.

It is my understanding that, from 1947 to 1964, of all the immigrants who have entered the United States, 16 percent or 350,000 were professional or technical people, while only 1 out of 10 of the American force was professional or technical.

Mr. FONG. That is my understanding.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. One out of every six immigrants since 1947 have been skilled workers compared with one out of eight of the U.S. labor force.

Mr. FONG. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The provisions of the pending bill, which the Senator from Hawaii supports, as they relate to those who have skills and attempt to come to the United States are even more stringent.

Mr. FONG. As I will show subsequently in my statement, several provisions of the pending bill are very stringent in protecting the American economy.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I believe that the Senator has been very ably directing his remarks in this part of his extremely exhaustive analysis of the present legislation to demonstrating that many of those who will come to our country will be coming under preference Nos. 3 and 6 of the pending legislation, and that those who come within these categories will really be highly skilled and that many of them will fill

critical shortages which presently exist in our country.

Mr. FONG. The Senator is correct. I will also point out subsequently in my statement that we have not contributed anything to the education of those people. When one considers that it costs a great deal of money to educate a student so that he will become a skilled technician or a professional person, it will be realized that we are gaining vast resources which are worth billions of dollars to our country.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, during the hearings it was suggested that, by setting high standards for those who attempt to gain entry into the United States, we would be attracting skilled people from other parts of the world.

Does the Senator agree with me that all we are trying to assure by means of the immigration policy suggested by this legislation is that if an individual wants to come to the United States, he ought to be considered fairly and equitably on the basis of individual merit and worth, and also because of his familial relationship, and that we are safeguarding the work force in the United States by establishing high standards that we feel are fair to all people? Does the Senator agree that, if an individual possesses a particular skill, he should be permitted to come to this country regardless of his place of birth or any other such irrelevant consideration?

Mr. FONG. The Senator is correct. Our first consideration in an immigration reform bill should be the individual worth of each immigrant. Having made this judgment, another primary consideration is the protection of the American economy and the wages and working conditions of American labor. Immigration reform legislation should safeguard the employment opportunities, wage levels, and high standards of working conditions of American labor.

We have written very specific language into this bill to achieve these ends, as I will specify later in my statement.

When we set up qualifications for people to come to our country, we say to them, "If you wish to come, you may come. These are the qualifications that we have established for your entry into the United States."

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the Senator from Hawaii has made a very useful contribution on this particular point.

One of the great misunderstandings in the consideration of the entire immigration legislation is the belief that not only have recent immigrants been unskilled and thereby contributed to the unemployment problem, but also that this pending legislation will contribute to unemployment.

I believe that the Senator has discussed exhaustively and completely what we shall be doing namely, stimulating further job opportunities for the American workers.

I believe that this is an extremely important point.

September 20, 1965

23576

I commend the Senator for the way in which he has addressed himself to the problem.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for his remarks.

Mr. President, to cite one set of figures from table X, in 1958 a person with elementary school education can expect to earn \$154,114 from age 18 to death, and \$127,286 from 25 to 64; with a college

education, \$435,242 from 18 to death, and \$366,990 from 25 to 64. Data is taken from the Occupational Outlook Quarterly, 1961.

Since most higher paying jobs require a high degree of training and education, it is not surprising that persons having more education are employed in better jobs. As of March 1962, the median years of schooling for professional and technical workers was 10.2, as compared

to 12.5 for clerical employees, and 8.5 to 10.1 for unskilled persons—see table XI.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record table XI, which shows median years of school completed by employed persons 18 years old and over, by major occupation group and sex, 1952-62.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TABLE XI.—Median years of school completed by employed persons 18 years old and over, by major occupation group and sex, 1952-62

Major occupation groups	Both sexes				Male				Female			
	October 1952	March 1957	March 1959	March 1962	October 1952	March 1957	March 1959	March 1961	October 1952	March 1957	March 1959	March 1962
All occupation groups.....	10.8	11.7	12.0	12.1	10.4	11.2	11.7	12.1	12.0	12.1	12.2	12.3
Professional and managerial workers.....	12.9	13.2	13.5	13.9	12.8	12.9	13.2	13.5	14.0	14.4	14.0	14.7
Professional, technical, and kindred workers.....	16+	16+	16.2	16.2	16+	16+	16.4	16.4	16+	16+	15.9	16.1
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm.....	12.2	12.4	12.4	12.5	12.2	12.4	12.4	12.5	12.2	12.5	12.2	12.4
Farmers and farm managers, laborers, and foremen.....	8.3	8.5	8.6	8.7	8.4	8.4	8.6	8.7	8.0	(1)	8.7	8.9
Farmers and farm managers.....	8.5	8.6	8.7	8.8	8.5	8.6	8.7	8.8	8.5	(2)	(1)	(1)
Farm laborers and foremen.....	7.5	8.2	8.3	8.5	7.2	7.4	7.7	8.3	7.9	8.7	(3)	(1)
Clerical and sales workers.....	12.4	12.4	12.5	12.6	12.4	12.5	12.5	12.6	12.4	12.4	12.4	12.5
Clerical and kindred workers.....	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.4	12.4	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5
Sales workers.....	12.3	12.4	12.4	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.6	12.0	12.0	12.2	12.1
Craftsman, operatives, and laborers, except farm and mine.....	9.2	9.7	10.0	10.4	9.1	9.7	10.1	10.2	9.4	(1)	9.8	10.0
Craftsman, foremen, and kindred workers.....	10.1	10.5	11.0	11.2	10.1	10.5	11.0	11.2	11.5	11.3	11.2	9.2
Operatives and kindred workers.....	9.1	9.5	9.9	10.1	9.0	9.6	10.0	10.2	9.3	9.3	9.7	9.9
Laborers, except farm and mine.....	8.3	8.5	8.6	8.9	8.3	8.5	8.5	8.9	8.5	(2)	(2)	10.0
Service workers, including private household.....	8.8	9.0	9.7	10.2	(1)	(1)	(1)	10.3	8.8	9.0	9.5	10.2
Private household workers.....	8.1	8.3	8.4	8.7	(2)	(2)	(2)	(1)	8.1	8.3	8.4	8.7
Other service workers.....	9.2	9.6	10.3	10.8	8.8	9.0	10.1	(1)	9.7	10.2	10.5	11.1

¹ Not available.

² Median not shown where base is less than 150,000 in 1957 or less than 100,000 in other years.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, table XI shows that workers with more education are employed in better jobs. As of March 1962, the median years of schooling for professional and technical workers was 16.2, as compared to 12.5 for clerical employees, and 8.5 to 10.1 for unskilled persons. Data were drawn from the Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics.

While the proportion of workers with less than 5 years of schooling fell during the past decade from 7.3 to 4.6 percent of the labor force, this 4.6 percent represents 3.1 million workers who are con-

sidered functional illiterates by the Government. See Manpower Report, March 1963, pages 12 and 13. By contrast, less than 1 percent of the immigrants to the United States are illiterate.

Although the rate of unemployment is high among all young people, it is far higher for youngsters who dropped out of school before graduating. For example, 27 percent of the dropouts in 1961 were unemployed, as compared with 18 percent of the high-school graduates. The high dropout rate in previous years is expected to continue into the 1970's, so that at least 7.5 million or 30 percent

of all young people entering the labor force in this decade will lack a high school education.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that table XII showing employment status of June high school graduates not enrolled in college and of school dropouts by year of graduation or dropout, sex, and color, and by marital status of women, October 1959-61 in my remarks.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TABLE XII.—Employment status of June high school graduates not enrolled in college and of school dropouts, by year of graduation or dropout, sex, and color, and by marital status of women, October 1959-61

(Thousands of persons 16 to 24 years of age)

Sex and color, and marital status	June high school graduates							School dropouts							Not in labor force
	Civilian noninstitutional population	Civilian labor force				Not in labor force	Civilian noninstitutional population	Civilian labor force							
		Total		Em- ployed	Unemployed			Total		Em- ployed	Unemployed				
		Num- ber	Percent of popu- lation		Num- ber			Percent of civil- ian labor force	Num- ber		Percent of popu- lation	Num- ber	Percent of civil- ian labor force		
1959															
Total	790	634	80.2	549	85	13.5	156	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	
Male	304	279	91.7	239	40	14.3	25	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	
Female	486	355	73.0	310	45	12.8	131	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	
Single	418	381	79.2	291	40	12.1	88	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	
Married and other marital status	68	24	(1)	19	5	(1)	43	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	

Footnotes at end of table.

September 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23577

TABLE XII.—*Employment status of June high school graduates not enrolled in college and of school dropouts, by year of graduation or dropouts, sex, and color, and by marital status of women, October 1959-61—Continued*

[Thousands of persons 16 to 24 years of age]

Sex and color, and marital status	June high school graduates							School dropouts						
	Civilian noninstitutional population	Civilian labor force					Not in labor force	Civilian noninstitutional population	Civilian labor force					Not in labor force
		Total		Em-ployed	Unemployed				Total		Em-ployed	Unemployed		
		Number	Percent of population		Number	Percent of civilian labor force			Number	Percent of population		Number	Percent of civilian labor force	
1960 ⁵														
Total.....	921	706	76.7	599	107	15.2	215	344	214	62.2	175	39	18.2	130
Male.....	348	308	88.5	262	46	14.9	40	165	126	76.4	102	24	19.0	39
Female.....	573	398	69.5	337	61	15.3	175	179	88	49.2	73	16	(4)	91
Single.....	473	359	75.9	308	51	14.2	114	110	71	64.5	60	11	(4)	39
Married and other marital status ³	100	39	39.0	29	10	(4)	61	69	17	(4)	13	4	(4)	52
White.....	848	663	77.0	568	85	13.0	195	273	163	59.7	133	30	18.4	110
Nonwhite.....	73	53	(4)	31	22	(4)	20	71	51	(4)	42	9	(4)	20
1961														
Total.....	916	730	79.7	599	131	17.9	186	354	239	67.5	175	64	26.8	115
Male.....	345	297	86.1	242	55	18.5	48	179	150	83.8	108	42	28.0	29
Female.....	571	433	75.8	357	76	17.6	138	175	89	50.9	67	22	(4)	86
Single.....	482	392	81.3	326	66	16.8	90	119	75	63.0	55	20	(4)	44
Married and other marital status ³	89	41	(4)	31	10	(4)	48	56	14	(4)	12	2	(4)	42
White.....	814	651	80.0	545	106	16.3	163	283	189	66.8	134	55	29.1	94
Nonwhite.....	102	79	77.4	54	25	(4)	23	71	50	(4)	41	9	(4)	21

¹ Data not available by color.² Not available.

² Other marital status includes widowed and divorced persons, and married persons with spouse absent.

⁴ Percent not shown where base is less than 100,000.

[†] Data include Alaska and Hawaii beginning with 1960 and are therefore not strictly comparable with data for 1959.

Source: "President's 1963 Manpower Report."

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, table XII shows that dropouts have significantly higher rates of unemployment than high school graduates.

While the unemployment rate for high school graduates in 1961 was a high 17.9 percent, the comparable rate for youth who had dropped out of school was a very high 26.8 percent.

Data was taken from the President's 1963 Manpower Report.

In addition to the monetary value of an education, the underlying philosophy of the Peace Corps well illustrates the point: the United States sends skilled, professional and technically proficient persons to developing nations whose economic and cultural levels may thereby be lifted and improved. The great success of this Peace Corps idea abroad may be said to operate with equal success in the reverse—that skilled technicians and knowledgeable persons from other countries can and have helped improve the American economic and cultural levels.

There is no doubt that every educated immigrant admitted into the country adds immeasurably to our economic and social wealth. The training of professional and technical workers is a costly

undertaking and represents a substantial national economic investment.

It has been estimated that it costs \$35,000 to raise a child and send him through college. If this estimate is correct, then the immigrant scientists and engineers who came here since 1952 represented an investment in human capital of approximately \$1.25 billion. Together with other highly trained and educated immigrants, the United States has received about \$3.5 billion in human capital since 1952 because of immigration.

Thus, because a large number of immigrants to this country are fully trained when they arrive, the United States, as the receiving country, benefits greatly from the education and training acquired in the nation of the immigrant's origin. Not only do they bring with them a wide diversity of knowledge, education, and training which is badly needed throughout our economy, but they also bring with them a willingness to work.

IMMIGRATION HELPS AGE SHORTAGE

The fifth point regarding the impact of immigration on the economy is that, particularly during the coming decade, immigrants can help make up for a

shortage of people in the central age ranges, from 25 through 44. We are indeed in critically short supply of workers in this age bracket, because during the depression years of the 1930's the number of children born in the United States fell off sharply. The 1930 babies are now in the 25-to-44 age bracket, a group which normally supplies many of the skilled workers, technicians, and middle management personnel and a group relied on heavily by employers. In 1960 only about 26 percent of the U.S. population was in that age range—considered by economists the prime years of a person's working life.

Census Bureau figures show that an increasingly high proportion of immigrants admitted to the United States in recent years has been in the 25-to-44 age range.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that table XIII, entitled "Immigrants Admitted, by Sex and Age: Years Ended June 30, 1953-62," be received and printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

23578

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 20, 1965

TABLE XIII.—Immigrants admitted, by sex and age, years ended June 30, 1953-62

Sex and age	1953-62	1963	1964	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962
Number admitted	2,599,349	170,434	208,177	237,790	331,625	326,867	253,265	260,686	265,398	271,344	283,763
Males	1,185,440	73,073	95,594	112,032	116,410	155,201	109,121	114,367	116,687	121,380	131,676
Under 5 years	117,489	7,226	8,708	9,587	14,087	15,766	11,976	11,511	12,299	13,203	13,126
5 to 9 years	95,053	6,273	7,769	8,783	12,419	13,452	9,488	8,960	8,570	9,604	9,735
10 to 14 years	75,817	4,345	5,613	6,730	9,323	9,898	7,694	7,975	7,731	8,295	8,313
15 years	13,805	732	870	1,303	1,847	1,764	1,304	1,363	1,493	1,446	1,683
16 to 17 years	83,321	1,761	2,211	3,104	4,581	4,247	3,190	3,237	3,565	3,537	3,888
18 to 19 years	45,839	2,103	2,890	4,226	5,204	5,953	4,294	4,739	4,579	5,171	5,380
20 to 24 years	164,531	7,777	10,341	13,986	20,537	20,114	13,782	15,999	15,836	16,618	19,541
25 to 29 years	184,987	11,922	16,447	17,625	21,783	23,986	17,493	17,306	17,788	18,349	21,288
30 to 34 years	144,130	9,861	13,543	14,950	12,883	19,637	12,841	12,487	12,919	13,063	15,146
35 to 39 years	98,270	6,798	8,456	9,106	12,581	12,652	8,840	9,189	9,669	9,802	10,877
40 to 44 years	72,124	5,141	6,950	8,492	11,311	9,745	6,896	6,721	5,827	6,247	6,854
45 to 49 years	56,076	3,587	4,975	6,128	8,523	7,166	4,545	5,346	5,369	5,326	5,111
50 to 54 years	37,831	2,404	3,560	3,703	5,306	4,561	3,076	3,784	3,762	3,865	3,810
55 to 59 years	24,389	1,511	2,046	2,065	3,035	2,917	2,050	2,752	2,646	2,652	2,715
60 to 64 years	14,508	830	1,107	1,100	1,433	1,579	1,268	1,772	1,801	1,756	1,862
65 to 69 years	8,897	508	636	587	813	892	737	1,168	1,187	1,218	1,151
70 to 74 years	4,600	277	309	289	407	445	390	579	592	732	590
75 to 79 years	2,295	118	159	143	209	214	176	317	294	322	343
80 years and over	1,235	99	86	109	99	130	105	129	146	168	164
Not reported	243	10	18	16	29	83	36	23	14	6	8
Females	1,413,909	97,361	112,583	125,758	165,215	171,666	144,144	146,319	148,711	149,964	152,188
Under 5 years	112,371	7,162	8,188	9,065	13,661	14,950	11,172	11,005	11,799	13,001	12,368
5 to 9 years	92,591	6,107	7,429	8,342	11,958	13,102	9,239	8,800	8,953	9,320	9,341
10 to 14 years	74,742	4,331	5,639	6,684	9,173	9,326	7,763	7,811	7,655	8,139	8,231
15 years	14,571	840	989	1,335	1,961	1,882	1,498	1,401	1,395	1,536	1,734
16 to 17 years	44,997	2,878	3,189	4,187	5,440	5,421	4,709	4,621	4,690	4,915	4,947
18 to 19 years	86,695	4,950	6,263	8,060	9,704	9,386	9,091	9,465	9,668	9,825	9,983
20 to 24 years	282,251	18,096	22,125	24,466	30,897	31,244	29,253	30,119	31,838	31,366	31,946
25 to 29 years	213,844	16,317	18,730	19,921	24,852	26,060	22,181	21,384	21,755	21,209	21,445
30 to 34 years	144,848	10,323	12,230	13,299	17,571	18,827	14,698	14,585	14,529	14,211	14,275
35 to 39 years	93,150	6,783	7,224	7,755	10,364	11,418	9,376	10,073	9,989	10,071	10,096
40 to 44 years	69,074	5,460	6,131	6,823	9,062	8,984	6,656	6,431	6,232	6,497	6,788
45 to 49 years	57,592	4,162	4,821	5,303	7,158	6,833	5,793	6,071	5,941	5,786	5,794
50 to 54 years	45,016	3,437	3,722	3,977	5,114	4,397	4,949	4,833	4,746	4,883	4,888
55 to 59 years	33,156	2,389	2,487	2,710	3,606	3,831	3,405	3,737	3,610	3,499	3,585
60 to 64 years	21,881	1,422	1,638	1,699	2,161	2,355	2,253	2,729	2,515	2,484	2,755
65 to 69 years	13,395	890	894	1,053	1,260	1,409	1,303	1,599	1,565	1,649	1,773
70 to 74 years	7,527	500	502	610	703	761	818	872	767	997	997
75 to 79 years	3,886	273	293	315	384	404	406	414	386	512	499
80 years and over	2,031	137	164	164	227	233	181	220	175	226	304
Not reported	291	7	24	19	30	86	52	33	16	5	19

Source: U.S. Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Estimated changes in the number of workers in each age group from 1960 to 1970, with and without immigration

[In millions]

	With immigration	Without immigration
Total, all ages	12.6	11.1
Under 25	6.2	5.9
25 to 34	1.6	1.1
35 to 44	—3	—7
45 and over	5.1	4.8

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, table XIII shows that a large proportion of immigrants, both male and female, in that period were in the 25-to-44 age bracket—about 1 million of about 2.5 million.

Source of this data is the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Labor Department projections for the 1960's, shown in the following table, indicate how significantly immigration could

contribute to alleviate the worker shortage in the central age range:

Estimated changes in the number of workers in each age group from 1960 to 1970, with and without immigration

[In millions]

	With immigration	Without immigration
Total, all ages	12.6	11.1
Under 25	6.2	5.9
25 to 34	1.6	1.1
35 to 44	—3	—7
45 and over	5.1	4.8

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that table XIV, entitled "Changes in Total Labor Force, by Age and Sex, 1950-75," be received and made a part of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

September 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

23579

TABLE XIV.—Changes in total labor force, by age and sex, 1950-75

(Numbers in thousands)

Age and sex	Actual		Projected		Change, 1950-60		Change, 1960-70		Change, 1970-75	
	1950	1960 ¹	1970	1975	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Both sexes:										
14 years and over.....	64,749	73,081	85,703	93,031	8,332	12.9	12,622	17.3	7,328	8.6
14 to 24 years.....	13,331	13,697	19,891	21,787	366	2.7	6,164	45.0	1,926	9.7
25 to 44.....	29,263	31,878	33,235	37,023	2,615	8.9	1,357	4.3	3,788	11.4
25 to 34 years.....	15,145	15,099	16,709	20,806	-46	-3	1,610	10.7	4,097	24.5
35 to 44 years.....	14,118	16,779	16,526	16,217	2,661	18.8	-253	-1.5	-309	-1.9
45 years and over.....	22,156	27,506	32,607	34,221	5,350	24.1	5,101	18.5	1,614	4.9
45 to 64 years.....	19,119	24,127	29,128	30,510	5,008	26.2	5,001	20.7	1,382	4.7
65 years and over.....	3,037	3,379	3,479	3,711	342	11.3	100	3.0	232	6.7
Male:										
14 years and over.....	46,069	49,563	56,295	60,016	3,404	7.6	6,732	13.6	4,621	8.2
14 to 24 years.....	8,668	8,731	12,594	13,782	63	.7	3,863	44.2	1,188	9.4
25 to 44 years.....	20,996	22,394	23,003	25,671	1,398	6.7	609	2.7	2,668	11.1
25 to 34 years.....	11,044	10,940	11,990	14,916	-104	-.9	1,050	9.6	2,926	24.4
35 to 44 years.....	9,952	11,454	11,013	10,755	1,502	15.1	-441	-3.9	-258	-2.3
45 years and over.....	16,405	18,438	20,698	21,463	2,033	12.4	2,260	12.3	765	3.7
45 to 64 years.....	13,952	16,013	18,414	19,083	2,061	14.8	2,401	15.0	660	3.6
65 years and over.....	2,453	2,425	2,284	2,380	-28	-1.1	-141	-6.8	96	4.2
Female:										
14 years and over.....	18,680	23,518	29,408	32,115	4,838	25.9	5,890	25.0	2,707	9.2
14 to 24 years.....	4,663	4,966	7,267	8,005	303	6.5	2,301	46.3	738	10.2
25 to 44 years.....	8,267	9,484	10,232	11,352	1,217	14.7	748	7.9	1,120	10.9
25 to 34 years.....	4,101	4,159	4,719	5,890	58	1.4	560	13.5	1,171	24.8
35 to 44 years.....	4,166	5,325	5,513	5,462	1,159	27.8	188	3.5	-51	-.9
45 years and over.....	5,751	9,068	11,909	12,758	3,317	57.7	2,841	31.3	849	7.1
45 to 64 years.....	5,167	8,114	10,714	11,427	2,947	57.0	2,600	32.0	713	6.7
65 years and over.....	584	954	1,195	1,331	370	63.4	241	25.3	136	11.4

¹ Alaska and Hawaii are included beginning with 1960. The 1960 estimates for the labor force differ slightly from those derived from the monthly labor force survey because they were adjusted to be consistent with the revised 1960 population estimates published by the Bureau of the Census in Current Population Reports, Series P-25 No. 241.

NOTE.—Individual items may not add to totals because of rounding.

Source: "President's 1963 Manpower Report."

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, figures drawn from table XIV show that the shortage of workers in the critical 25-to-44 age bracket is expected to continue to 1970.

There would be 700,000 fewer workers in the 35-to-44 age group in 1970 than in 1960 if there were no immigration. But with immigration continuing at present levels, this key age group would be only 300,000 fewer by 1970.

ADMISSIONS ADJUSTED ADMINISTRATIVELY

The sixth point about the economic implications of immigration is that, by and large, adjustments in the timing of admissions of immigrants with different skills to U.S. employment levels and needs may perhaps best be handled administratively. When we are in short supply of medical technicians, for example, at a particular time and have an adequate supply of machinists, then we should adjust our immigration priorities to admit more medical technicians and temporarily suspend admission of machinists. Australia and Canada, nations which have embarked on ambitious programs of immigration, so administer their immigration, and with remarkable success.

J. L. Marion, of the Canadian Immigration Office, said:

I should emphasize that immigration is for Canada an economically stimulating factor and hence we feel that some immigration is desirable even in periods of economic recession although at such time extra care

must be taken to insure that the migrants are well qualified and will not enter into competition with unemployed Canadian workers.

Figures provided by Canadian Labour Congress show that when immigration was high in relation to the labor force, unemployment was low; on the other hand, when immigration was low in relation to the labor force, unemployment was high.

Exclusions based on economic as well as social factors, administered flexibly and pragmatically, are justified. But to arbitrarily exclude skilled or gifted persons needed in this Nation merely because he is a Polynesian, a Negro, or an oriental, or because the country of his birth has a small quota—our experience under the 1952 Immigration Act has been precisely this—is to effectuate undemocratic as well as economically wasteful policies.

As the New York Times editorialized on July 25, 1963, "each immigrant's worth is best judged by personal qualities and skills, not by group stereotypes."

PROVISIONS PROTECT AMERICAN ECONOMY

Incorporated in the bill now pending before the Senate are three provisions to protect American workers and the economy:

First, Third preference immigrants, provided for under section 3 of the bill, must be "qualified immigrants who are members of the professions, or who because of their exceptional ability in the sciences or the arts will substantially

benefit prospectively the national economy, cultural interests, or welfare of the United States."

Second, Sixth preference immigrants—provided for in the same section 3—must be "qualified immigrants who are capable of performing specified skilled or unskilled labor, not of a temporary or seasonal nature, for which a shortage of employable and willing persons exists in the United States."

Third, Sections 3 and 10 of the bill require the Secretary of Labor to make an affirmative finding that "first, there are not sufficient workers in the United States and at the place to which the alien is destined to perform such skilled or unskilled labor; and, second, the employment of such aliens will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of the workers in the United States similarly employed."

What H.R. 2580 proposes for America is fundamentally sound. It rests on the very principles in which we profess belief. It is an integral part of mankind's struggle to achieve equality, justice, dignity, and brotherhood.

Now, Mr. President, I come to the second argument immigration reform legislation.

One of the oldest and most emotional arguments against changing our immigration laws is the fear that an increase in the number of Asian immigrants would upset the historical and cultural pattern of American life. An objective

28580

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 20, 1965

examination of the facts dispels this fear as groundless.

According to the 1960 census, the population of the United States included 464,332 persons of Japanese ancestry, twenty-six one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total population; 237,292 persons of Chinese ancestry, thirteen one-hundredths of 1 percent; 176,310 persons of Filipino ancestry, nine one-hundredths of 1 percent; and 218,089 in a category designated "All others," including persons of Korean, Indian of the Far East, Polynesian, Indonesian, and other non-white ancestries except Negroes and American Indians, about twelve one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total population.

There were, then, in the United States on 1960 only 1,093,023 persons of oriental and Polynesian extraction, or sixty-one one-hundredths of 1 percent of a total of 180 million people—an extraordinarily small minority—not even 1 percent of our population. And as envisaged under our proposed immigration bill, the total allotment for nations of Asia and the Pacific would be 26,990, or only 10.8 percent of the total immigration annually—surely a small enough proportion, since the Asia Pacific area contains over half of the world's population.

CULTURAL ENRICHMENT AND A SOURCE OF STRENGTH

Contributions of our American citizens of Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Korean, and Polynesian ancestry, and others whose antecedents are native to the triangle area in the building of our country have been significant. They have achieved distinction in nearly every field of endeavor: artistic, scientific, political, socioeconomic, religious, military, financial, industrial, and otherwise.

Once thought to be unassimilable, today they are as much a part as any other ethnic group in the mainstream of American life.

Studies by such scholars as Prof. Harry H. L. Kitano, of UCLA, "Final Report," National Institute of Mental Health, Project Grant, Japanese Crime and Delinquency in the United States, January 1965; Prof. Yamato Ichihashi, of Stanford University, "Japanese in the United States," Stanford University Press, 1952; Rose Hum Lee, "The Chinese in the United States of America," Hong Kong University Press, 1960; and other works by such scholars as E. G. Mears, Bradford Smith, and those works published by J. P. Lippincott in the "Peoples of America" series all show that Americans of oriental ancestry have contributed economically and culturally to our Nation and are great assets in the American body politic.

In addition, they serve well as bridges of understanding between our people and the peoples of Asia and the Pacific, for in sharing common ethnic origins, they are able to reach much better the peoples of the triangle area with their messages of good will, democratic freedom and individual dignity.

A NATION OF IMMIGRANTS

Historically, the United States is an immigrant country. The world came to regard us as a haven where freedom was to be found. Since the first settling of

this land, over 40 million people have migrated to America. There is no part of our society which has not been refined by the contributions of aliens who have come to make their home in the United States. This is the essence of our Union. It is its strength. The unequaled economic prosperity and vigorous culture of the Nation are due to the ingenuity, resourcefulness, hard labor, and ideals of people of several score of nationalities—but all American.

Oscar Handlin writes:

Our remarkable national development testifies to the wisdom of our early and continuing belief in immigration. Our growth as a nation has been achieved, in large measure, through the genius and industry of immigrants of every race and from every quarter of the world. The story of their pursuit of happiness is the saga of America. Their brains and their brawn helped to settle our land, to advance our agriculture, to build our industries, to develop our commerce, to produce new inventions, and, in general, to make us the leading nation that we now are.

In 1959, President Eisenhower said in a message to Congress:

The strength of this Nation may be measured in many ways—military might, industrial productivity, scientific contributions, its system of justice, its freedom from autocracy, the fertility of its land and prowess of its people. Yet, no analytical study can so dramatically demonstrate its position in the world as the simple truth that here, more than any other place, hundreds of thousands of people each year seek to enter and establish their homes and raise their children.

To the extent possible, without dislocating the lives of those already living here, this flow of immigration to this country must be encouraged. These persons who seek entry to this country seek more than a share in our material prosperity. The contributions of successive waves of immigrants show that they do not bring their families to a strange land and learn a new language and a new way of life simply to indulge themselves with comforts. Their real concern is with their children, and as a result those who have struggled for the right of American citizenship have, in countless ways, shown a deep appreciation of its responsibilities. The names of those who make important contributions in . . . almost every other field of endeavor indicates that there has been no period in which the immigrants to this country have not richly rewarded it for its liberality in receiving them.

To understand the message of these paragraphs, we need only to point to the 15 U.S. Nobel Prizewinners in physics and chemistry who were immigrants to this country; we need only to think of a few immigrants—Noguchi, a poor Japanese peasant who became one of the world's greatest scientists in the United States; Japanese Artist Yasuo Kuniyoshi; Lin Yu Tang, Chinese philosopher and author; Dr. Chen Ning Yang and Dr. Tsung Dao Lee, who jointly won the Nobel Prize for physics while engaged in research in the Princeton Institute of Advanced Studies; D. S. Saund, an Indian who was elected Congressman from California; Jiddu Krishnamurti, Hindu poet and philosopher; Werner von Braun and the entire team of scientists whom Dr. von Braun brought with him from Germany to work for the U.S. Government at the Redstone Arsenal; England's Samuel Gompers, of the labor

movement; the German physicist, Albert Einstein; Ireland's Father Flanagan, founder of Boys' Town; the great Spanish philosopher, George Santayana; Hungary's Journalist Joseph Pulitzer; Austrian-born Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Felix Frankfurter; Polish Pianist Artur Rubinstein; the brilliant Italian atomic physicist, Enrico Fermi; the great maestro of the Philadelphia Orchestra, Hungarian Eugene Ormandy, to name a few who have made notable contributions in American culture and thought.

As a nation of immigrants, we have developed a racially heterogeneous society in which citizens of many cultures and ethnic origins live and work side by side to make the American dream a reality.

IDEAL OF BROTHERHOOD, EQUALITY

We live in brotherhood; we believe in it, for we know it has real prospect for success nationally and internationally, and it has the force of logic.

Believing in this ideal and constantly working to achieve it, we cannot but write from our books the discriminatory quota provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which give offense to many peoples of the world.

During my tour of the Far East and southeast Asia, I was asked many questions about our immigration policies. I was pressed again and again to explain the small quotas we allot inhabitants of those nations. These people feel greatly the sting of discriminatory treatment.

America's role of leadership in the free world is one of great sensitivity, and our position is hardly enhanced by an immigration policy which implies that some nationalities and some ethnic groups are less desirable members of the American family.

Many countries of Asia and the Pacific have traditionally sought more than a token of immigration to the United States. These are the countries that will play a large and vital role in determining the future course of world events. Their friendship is crucial to all those who are fighting to preserve freedom.

The problem of immigration is no longer merely a domestic issue; on the contrary, it has great international significance.

While Secretary of State in 1956, John Foster Dulles said:

My primary concern as Secretary of State is that whatever overall quota is adopted by the Congress be apportioned equitably. Our quota restrictions should not discriminate among persons merely on the basis of their national origin, nor should the restrictions discriminate unfairly against any of the friendly nations which have an interest in common with us in the defense of the free world. The present system of determining quotas is offensive on both counts.

America's struggle with totalitarianism is a struggle to vindicate democracy's belief in the individual worth of human beings, as opposed to the totalitarian concept that individuals have no identity except as components in the political and economic structure of society.

Until the racial incongruities of our present basic immigration laws which discriminate against certain national and ethnic groups are eliminated, our

September 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23581

laws needlessly impede our struggle for global peace.

Our forebearers, coming to America from all corners of the world, have worked together to transform a vast continent of wilderness and desert into a powerful bastion of freedom and opportunity.

Mr. President, our Nation is the great pilot demonstration of the most influential principles and ideals in history. Our tenets of equality irrespective of race, creed, or color have inspired freedom-loving people everywhere to look to America as a beacon in their struggle to win freedom and independence. Our opportunity is to live up to these ideals.

Since 1924 we have come a long way in our immigration laws. Let us go the final mile in writing a fair and just law. We will then be demonstrating to the world that we practice what we preach, and that all men are equal under law.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator from Hawaii yield?

Mr. FONG. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I commend the Senator from Hawaii for what I believe to be one of the finest presentations I have ever heard on the question of our immigration policy.

Senators owe the Senator from Hawaii a great debt of gratitude for his extraordinary contribution in tracing the historical background by which this country arrived at one of the most prejudicial and distasteful parts of U.S. law; namely, the Asian-Pacific triangle.

I have had an opportunity to chair the committee hearings that we held on the immigration bill since February of this last year. The senior Senator from Hawaii has been in constant attendance on those hearings. His questions were pertinent, important, and revealing. He brought to the members of the subcommittee a better understanding and comprehension of this whole matter and how our present immigration law, to a very important extent, affects our relations with the Far East.

I think every Member of the Senate would recognize, and should recognize, the extraordinary contribution the Senator from Hawaii has made to the whole pending legislation. I speak for myself, but I know I speak for many other Members of the Senate, when I commend the Senator from Hawaii for his interest, his participation, and his understanding of this whole issue.

The speech itself which he delivered was most complete and thoughtful. I know it is a question in which he has been interested for many years, in this body and elsewhere. I know that he joins with the other members of the committee in looking forward to speedy and successful passage of this bill.

So I want to extend my congratulations to the Senator from Hawaii for his speech, for his exhaustive participation, his interest, and his constant counseling during the hearings in the subcommittee and in the consideration of the bill by the full committee. I think the product of his work is seen in the contribution

which he has made to the Record today. I commend the Senator from Hawaii for his efforts.

Mr. FONG. I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for his very kind and laudatory remarks. I hope they are deserved. I have worked very hard with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, during the course of hearings, deliberations of the subcommittee, and the full committee, and at other times.

The distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts has been in the forefront of efforts to write and enact a just and fair immigration reform bill. He has worked very diligently and tirelessly in championing this cause. As acting subcommittee chairman, he has called meeting after meeting. He has listened with great fairness to all sides presenting their views. Without the Senator from Massachusetts having been so indefatigably dedicated to the passage of this bill, we would not have a reform immigration bill on the Senate floor today. I commend him in the highest term for the very fine and excellent leadership in drafting and guiding this bill to the Senate floor.

Mr. President, it is quite an event when the descendant of an immigrant from Ireland [Mr. KENNEDY] stands on the floor of the Senate with the descendant of an old family from Boston, as represented by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHEL], who a while ago said his ancestors came from Yugoslavia, and the descendant of an immigrant who came from China, stand on the floor of the Senate today and together agree that we have at last a bill which is fair, just, and equitable, which does justice to all the people of the world, and which we think should be enacted. It is a great credit to the U.S. Congress that we have arrived at this day. A great share of the credit belongs to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. I would again like to express my thanks and appreciation to the Senator from Massachusetts for making this effort possible.

THE DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR ELMER THOMAS, OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. JAVITS obtained the floor.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I will not yield for the offering of an amendment to the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. It is not for that purpose.

Mr. JAVITS. With that understanding, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Oklahoma without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and it is so ordered.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, it was with deep sorrow and regret that my distinguished colleague [Mr. MONRONEY] and I learned of the death yesterday of former U.S. Senator Elmer Thomas, of Oklahoma. My colleague is prevented

by ill health from being present at this time, but he joins with me in this statement.

Born on a farm near Greencastle, Ind., September 8, 1876, Senator Thomas attended the common schools there and graduated from Central Normal College at Danville, Ind., in 1897, and from De Pauw University in Greencastle, Ind., in 1900.

He studied law and was admitted to the Indiana bar in 1897 and to the Oklahoma bar in 1900, commencing the practice of law in Oklahoma City, Okla.

With the opening of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Reservation to settlement in 1901, he moved his home and law practice to Lawton, Okla. At statehood, he was elected as a member of the first Oklahoma State Senate in 1907, where he served with distinction until 1920. He served continuously during that period as chairman of the Senate Appropriation Committee and was president pro tempore of that body from 1910 to 1913.

In 1920, Senator Thomas resigned from the Oklahoma State Senate to become a candidate for Congress, being unsuccessful in the first campaign, but to which office he was elected in 1923.

He served in the U.S. House of Representatives until 1927, when he was elected as a Member of the U.S. Senate from Oklahoma, and remained a Member of that body until January 3, 1951. He was distinguished in the U.S. Senate as a leader in the field of finance, was chairman of the Agriculture Committee, and was an authority on Indian affairs.

A lifelong Democrat, Senator Thomas was a delegate to all Democratic State conventions in Oklahoma from statehood in 1907 until 1950. He was a delegate from Oklahoma to all of the Democratic National Conventions from 1924 to 1950, and was chairman of the Oklahoma Democratic State convention in 1910.

He engaged in the practice of law in Washington, following his service in the U.S. Senate, and returned to Lawton in August, 1957, where he resided until his death.

Senator Thomas was a faithful public servant, and his good works will long survive him. My visits with him from time to time revealed to me the depth of his wisdom and the keenness of his sense of service. All of us will miss him.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. MONRONEY], I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 148), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and extreme regret the announcement of the death of Elmer Thomas, who served in the U.S. Senate from the State of Oklahoma from 1927 until 1951.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased, together with a transcript of remarks made in the Senate in praise of his distinguished service to the Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

23582

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 20, 1965

There being no objection, the resolution was considered, and unanimously agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for yielding to me.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, first I should like to express my support of the pending bill, H.R. 2580. I have some problems in respect to it, which I share with other Members of this body and other Members of Congress, but the important point I wish to emphasize first is that, in substance, I very much want to see this bill become law.

Leaving aside for the moment the problems, which I shall discuss in a moment, the bill represents a major achievement for Congress in the effort to wipe out immigration policies which for more than 40 years have discriminated against certain people coming into this country on the basis of their place of birth rather than their ability and qualification to enter the United States.

I take pride, together with the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], who just spoke—and he has a very deep place in our hearts—in the origins which are represented by some of us who are supporting these fundamental reforms. My own parents are immigrants, one was from what was known as the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and the other from what is now Israel and what was then known as Palestine.

Amazing divergencies are brought together, in this wonderful country under the authority of our Constitution, with all the strengths of differing origins contributing to and building America's total strength rather than in any way detracting from it.

Mr. President, the areas in which I find myself in considerable concern about the bill are essentially two: First, the absence of a statute of limitations, which has been one of the problems presented by the McCarran-Walter Act, with relation especially to the deportation of those who have been here in many cases for years, and frequently involving tragic instances in which people have had to be deported after spending 20, 30 or more years in this country and having established residence here.

The other problem which gives me great cause for concern, and which was also great cause for concern before the Judiciary Committee—and I have the honor to be a member of that committee—is the problem of the new—and I emphasize the word "new"—ceilings on Western Hemisphere immigration. This is a ceiling which we have never had before, a ceiling of 120,000 imposed by the bill upon Western Hemisphere immigration, with grave differences over what it will mean in terms of our relations with the rest of the nations of the Americas.

First, as to the fundamental bill. Our Nation has been made great by im-

migrants. Men and women from all over the world have contributed to the growth of our country, the prosperity of our economy, the diversity of our cultural heritage and the building of the United States as a nation.

Both the dictates of our consciences, as well as precepts of modern sociologists, tell us that immigration, as it exists in the national origins quota system, is wrong, and without any basis in reason or in fact, for we know better than to say that one man is better than another because of color of his skin or the country in which he was born.

I opposed the so-called McCarran-Walter Act, which I said compounded the inequities, injustices, and the discrimination of the national origins quota system, which we will now eliminate at long last. I voted to sustain the veto of that bill. The veto was to the credit of President Truman.

I come to this issue not as a Johnny-come-lately, but as the culmination of a long struggle in which I joined with many Senators in the Congress.

I fought for many years to bring about this immigration reform, and on many occasions protested bitterly and vigorously to efforts to satisfy the Congress by giving the country fixed quotas to alleviate some situation, with the only end result that the basic discrimination of the McCarran-Walter immigration law continued while Congress allowed itself to be satisfied with additional national quotas for one purpose or another.

It is, therefore, with deep gratification, after this struggle which began about 15 years ago, we are finally at a point where from all appearances we shall be embarking on a totally new path from the 1924 immigration law. Many words have been said on the floor of the Senate about all men being equal and about how all men should be given equal opportunity without regard to their race or color.

How then can we tolerate leaving such blatant and unfounded discrimination on our statute books as exists in the national origins quota system in which nearly 70 percent of the visas go to less than 5 countries and the remaining 30 percent for the rest of the world.

I believe most of us agree that it is high time that this be done away with. It has been 13 years since immigration injustice was perpetrated in the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, the McCarran-Walter Act. It is time to replace it.

Time and experience have more than dramatized the fact that, as its opponents contended 13 years ago, it is perhaps as unique a law as we have on our statute books. But these 11 years have also produced an atmosphere of political helplessness to exasperate even the most determined immigration reformers, so that today most are resigned to the now annual practice of settling for piecemeal revisions or temporary relief rather than an effective overhaul of our entire policy of immigration. The backdoor methods Congress has used to cover up deficiencies in the basic law is the greatest proof of the law's inadequacies. Since the McCarran-Walter Act was enacted,

Congress has passed special, short-term immigration and refugee legislation which has had the cumulative effect of admitting into the United States more than twice as many persons as permitted under the basic McCarran-Walter Act.

But even this piecemeal legislation has represented no relief to the thousands of American families with relatives in countries with heavily mortgaged and oversubscribed immigration quotas. This tragic situation is the result of that section of the McCarran-Walter Act which is admittedly based on national and racial discrimination—the national origins quota system, which remains today a target for Communist propaganda and making our effort to win over the uncommitted nations more difficult. It is based on the rejected racist assumption that people of one ethnic origin are superior, socially and culturally, to those of another. It was designed and is administered not to admit as many immigrants as we can readily absorb, but to exclude as many as possible.

The time has come to end this production on national image with meaningful reform of our immigration policy.

First and foremost, before I get into details to which I might take exception, I urge prompt passage of this legislation so that we can fashion an immigration policy of which this country can be proud instead of ashamed, as it has every right to be up to now.

This bill establishes a national quota outside the Western Hemisphere of 170,000, including 6 preference groups that may use up to 94 percent of the quota, and with 6 percent—10,200 visas set aside—for the conditional entry of refugees from anywhere in the world. Of this 6 percent, 3 percent may be used to adjust the status of refugees after 2 years residence in the United States.

The bill provides that, for the first 3 years after enactment, the area quotas now authorized—158,361—shall not be changed but that quota numbers not used in the prior year shall make up an immigration pool from which visas may be issued within the preferences established in H.R. 2580, as amended, and in chronological order of registration of oversubscriptions. The use of the pool is limited to the extent that the maximum number of visas issued from the area quota plus the pool for any country shall not exceed 20,000.

After the first 3 years there will be no area quotas, and all visas will be issued on a first-come, first-served basis within the preferences established in H.R. 2580, as amended.

We should be quick to realize that the additional immigrants who are being admitted are, for the most part, either family relations of people who are already here or professional and skilled people who will help our economy. Familial relationships have been given high priority in the preference system set up in H.R. 2580, receiving the first 40 percent.

This will permit the reunification of families which have been kept apart. There have been some very tragic cases in this regard. They have been kept apart because of many of

September 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23583

the inhuman restrictions contained in the present law. Indeed, I have had called to my attention many cases which have not been adjusted by special legislation—of parents separated from children because the children happen to be born in some other nation, where the quota was heavily against them, as contrasted with that of their parents. It has taken years and years, and sometimes has not happened at all, to reunite those families.

The reuniting of families is further enhanced by the provisions of H.R. 2580 which put parents of U.S. citizens outside the numerical limitation of 170,000 immigrants. This provision was also in the immigration reform bill (S. 1093) which I introduced last February. I have introduced many such reform bills during my service in the Congress.

In many countries which have had small quotas, many qualified people have either not been able to obtain visas or have not even tried because of the length of the waiting lists. It has sometimes taken 10 or more years before they could even remotely have hope of being reached.

The abolition of the national origins quota system and the new preference system will allow competent and needed people to enter the United States, to fill positions and jobs for which there is a shortage of qualified people in this country. For example, thousands of doctors and scientists, nurses and technicians will come to the United States in the next 15 years. For those who are worried about increasing the unemployment rolls, let me point out that no one—not a preference immigrant, a nonpreference immigrant, or a special immigrant from the Western Hemisphere—may enter without prior certification by the Secretary of Labor that he will not be taking the job of another American. This strict control and supervision should enable us to bring in those who can contribute to our Nation without the danger of adding people to the relief rolls.

Foreign nations have often criticized the United States for the national origin quota system, and it has been without doubt a hindrance to the conduct of our foreign relations. Communist nations have used it in their propaganda as an example of the bigotry of Americans—to our detriment in many parts of the world, especially the underdeveloped countries which have small immigration quotas, but where we need to win friends.

We are trying to wage a successful fight for freedom and democracy in Vietnam. We have no better way of demonstrating our faith in the people of Asia than by today's action in eliminating the Asia-Pacific triangle, the most discriminatory section of an unfair system. Such action should demonstrate that we consider the peoples of Asia to be on a fully equal basis with those of the rest of the world. No longer will we single out men and women of Asiatic ancestry and tell them that they are different from others, no matter where they were born. This provision brings to an

end a series of measures which laid aside the earlier Chinese exclusion laws, but which themselves were so iniquitous. Now, at long last, these peoples have been put on their rightful basis of equality. In this regard, the bill, S. 1093, which I introduced last February, contained provisions for the immediate elimination of the national origins quota system, including the Asia-Pacific triangle.

I would like to address myself to the provision of the bill containing the Western Hemisphere limitation of 120,000, which constitutes the most controversial part of the bill before us. I believe in the bill's authority for creating a commission to study the various aspects of immigration and population growth in the Western Hemisphere. To establish such a commission is reasonable enough. But I see no reason why, together with that commission must be joined a numerical limitation on immigration from the Western Hemisphere.

I disagree with the principle of stating a numerical limitation on immigration from that part of the world, and so voted in the subcommittee and in the full committee against the imposition of the 120,000 limitation. I say that because our special relationship with our sister Republics in the Americas was established at least 100 years ago, before the present immigration system was established. At that time the number of people we admitted from this hemisphere was 190,000, when our total population was half what it is today.

The average comparable immigration from the Western Hemisphere over the past 10 years has been about 110,000. Last year, the number of nonquota status immigrants from the Western Hemisphere was somewhat in excess of 135,000. I think the limitation of 120,000 will contribute to an impairment of better Western Hemisphere relations, in which we have been so intensely interested. I refer my colleagues to the testimony of the Secretary of State at pages 98 to 100 of the House Immigration Subcommittee hearings and at page 49 of the Senate subcommittee hearings.

I point out in this respect, because I think it is extremely important, that many people say we have not heard from the people in Latin America; that there does not seem to be an outcry about this situation in Latin America. But, Mr. President, this is rarely the case. We rarely hear such an outcry when a bill is pending in Congress. Sometimes it happens, but most often it does not. It is only when a bill becomes law and the people begin to feel the pressure of the bill upon them that they begin to react and protest.

I am deeply concerned about the strong propaganda tool which the limitation of 120,000 would give to demagogues, especially Communist demagogues, in Latin America, who may play this theme to a fair-then-well. They may say that the United States is following the Dominican episode, which hurt us materially in Latin America; that the United States is imposing a limitation upon immigration from the other

American republics, a limitation which has never been imposed before; thereby confirming the historic exclusionist policy of the United States.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Even this limitation accommodates the number of nonquota immigrants the United States has had, on the average, in the last decade, and the number we had last year, because added to the 120,000 would be the unmarried children and spouses who would be free of the 120,000 limitation, making an estimated 20,000 to 30,000 in addition. So the level of availability of immigration into the United States from the Western Hemisphere would be approximately the same as the level reached last year.

However, we shall never break through the barrage of calumny which will be hurled against us. It will be used and reused to a fair-then-well. The restriction will harvest another problem for us—a problem relating to our relations with Latin America, which area is extremely sensitive on this point in terms of both personal dignity and national dignity of the respective countries concerned. It would also impose a useless limitation upon the other American states concerned. To impose a useless limitation on the other American states is most unwise and improvident in my judgment. As Attorney General Katzenbach testified, approximately 70,000 of the Western Hemisphere immigrants come from Mexico and Canada.

I point out that the House did set this limitation, but that we are proposing to do it. The House, in fact, voted down by 218 to 189 on August 25 an amendment to impose a ceiling of 115,000 for the Western Hemisphere. I know that this limitation is discussed as a part of a package by which the entire bill would be accepted in the Senate, and that it might otherwise be blocked by an extended debate or a filibuster, or that it might not have gotten out of the committee if that point had not successfully carried.

I make no criticism of those who would go along with that policy. Perhaps a nose count which I and others are making may very well indicate that there is nothing to be done about it in the Senate at this time. However, this does not in any way prevent me from protesting it, not so much on an emotional ground as upon the ground that it is most unwise and improvident in terms of the relationships of the United States with the other countries of the Americas.

The question of whether specific efforts will be undertaken about the matter on the floor, or even be attempted, still remains to be decided. However, I raise my voice, as I did in subcommittee and in committee, against it as an action which, in my judgment, is most unwise, unnecessary, and very sad indeed in this very sensitive area.

I am pleased that with respect to another issue the Committee on the Judiciary has accepted an amendment which I proposed, along with some of my colleagues on the committee, the

Senator in charge of the bill, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] to permit Western Hemisphere refugees to adjust their status to that of lawful permanent residents once they have arrived in the United States, and without leaving the country, as is required for other Western Hemisphere immigrants under the provisions of the pending bill.

At this time, such a provision would apply to those who escape from Cuba. Because the United States does not have diplomatic relations with Cuba, it is impossible for Cubans to obtain immigrant visas through normal channels, as is the case for people in other Western Hemisphere countries.

Since the takeover in Cuba by Fidel Castro on January 1, 1959, some 280,058 people of Cuban birth entered the United States, of which number 55,535 were immigrants and 100,284 were paroled refugees.

The year 1962 was the peak year for the admission of parolees, with the number reaching almost 65,000. Since the break in diplomatic relations with Cuba, the peak year for entering immigrants was 1964 with 12,554. Though it is impossible to state exactly how many, it is fair to assume that a reasonable proportion of these immigrants were parolees who first entered the United States and then journeyed to Canada or Mexico in order to enter as immigrants. My amendment would make that very heavy expense and burden unnecessary for those who had left Cuba.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a tabulation supplied by the Immigration and Naturalization Service of Cubans who have entered the United States year by year. This tabulation is headed, "Cubans Who Have Entered the United States, 1959 to 1965."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Cubans who have entered the United States, 1959-65

	Total	Immigrants	Nonimmigrants	Parolees
1959.....	62,800	6,700	55,100	-----
1960.....	60,781	12,554	48,227	1,690
1961.....	58,857	6,796	18,892	25,170
1962.....	73,632	5,778	3,093	64,761
1963.....	15,535	6,024	884	8,027
1964.....	11,899	11,050	769	80
1965 (January to June).....	4,544	3,033	965	556

Source: Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think that is a very desirable aspect of the bill. I hope very much that it will be retained without change.

Mr. President, during the discussions of this bill in the subcommittee, I raised the proposal, included in the bills which I introduced in the last Congress and in this, of the establishment in the Department of State of a Board of Visa Appeals

to review visa determinations made by our consuls and vice consuls overseas.

The present state of the law puts the consul in the position of being the final authority on the issuance or denial of the visas. A system of advisory opinions by reviewing authorities exists, but the review is limited to questions of law, and an alien who may have been wrongfully denied a visa has no recourse of appeal on the substantive decision of issuance or denial of the visa.

At the present time the decision relating to the issuance of a visa to an alien is made by a consular officer. If a consul wishes to refuse a visa, he may ask for an advisory opinion from the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the State Department. These opinions are considering binding on officer as to questions of law but not as to questions of fact. Still the consular officer makes the final decision, and the disadvantaged alien has no recourse.

The President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization in 1953 urged that visa matters be subject to review by such a Board.

The Board which I proposed would consist of three members who would be appointed by the Secretary of State. They would have no other duties, even though employees of the State Department. The Board would have jurisdiction to review any determinations denying, withdrawing, or revoking a visa or an extension of a visa whose issuance is subject to the direction of the Secretary of State, as well as any determination as to the application of any rule or regulation of the Department relating to immigration. The Board may accept or decline any cases referred to it. The Secretary could direct the Board to refer certain cases to him or the Board could refer cases on its own initiative to the Secretary for review.

The Attorney General has given his assurances that he will investigate what means there are within his Department and the Department of State to provide some relief, and that this matter will be again considered next year with respect to further legislation to correct certain procedural aspects of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The report on H.R. 2580 at page 26 makes clear the intent of the Attorney General to study the creation of a Board of Visa Appeals.

Another proposal which the Attorney General has indicated will receive consideration is the establishment of a 10-year statute of limitations on deportation proceedings. The proposal, it has been agreed, will, because of this further consideration by the Attorney General, not be raised on the floor.

The act already provides that the Attorney General may, at his discretion, suspend deportation proceedings in the case of aliens who have been physically present in the United States for 7 years or, in the case of certain serious offenses, 10 years. An amendment which I offered in the subcommittee and am asking be printed today would not change this provision, but rather establish a limit to 10 years after the occurrence of conduct which makes a lawfully admitted alien deportable during which the Immigration

and Naturalization Service may institute deportation proceedings. This 10-year period would appear to provide sufficient time to conduct a full investigation and institute proceedings.

Under this amendment the statute of limitations would apply only to aliens who had entered the United States lawfully. Further, it would apply only to those aliens who remained continuously in the United States for the 10-year period following the acts for which they are deportable. Thus, for example, an alien could not engage in deportable activities and then leave the United States to evade the Immigration and Naturalization Service and have the 10-year statute of limitations running at the same time.

Mr. President, as I have said there are two matters in the bill which give me special concern. The numerical limitation on immigration from the Western Hemisphere, and the time to commence deportation proceedings against those who have been admitted for lawful residence into the United States.

I believe these two matters, at least, should be before us should we think it advisable to deal with them. Therefore, I submit for printing in the Record amendments which would deal with these subjects to establish a clear legislative record on these issues. One, to establish a 10-year statute of limitations on deportation proceedings for lawfully admitted aliens, and the other, to eliminate the Western Hemisphere limitation of 120,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be printed in the Record.

The amendments are as follows:

On page 58, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 22. Title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by adding at the end of such title the following section:

"LIMITATION ON TIME OF COMMENCING DEPORTATION PROCEEDINGS

"Sec. 293. No alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence shall be deported by reason of any conduct occurring more than ten years prior to the institution of deportation proceedings against him, if such alien has resided continuously, and has been physically present, within the United States for at least ten years immediately after such conduct occurred."

On page 59, line 5, strike out "Sec. 23." and insert "Sec. 24."

On page 59, after the matter between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

"(d) The table of contents (Title II—Immigration, chapter 9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 293. Limitation on time of commencing deportation proceedings."

On page 59, line 15, strike out "Sec. 24." and insert "Sec. 25."

On page 56, beginning with line 24, strike out all through line 7, on page 57.

On page 57, line 8, strike out "(f)" and insert "(e)".

On page 57, line 11, strike out "(g)" and insert "(f)".

On page 57, line 25, strike out "(h)" and insert "(g)".

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I would like to conclude by saying that the bill marks a historic departure, a historic

September 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23585

turn in immigration legislation and policy, and places our country in the forefront of the nations of the world which wish to do justice in terms of an open world extending not only to goods, but to people. That, I feel, is the ultimate objective of freedom and the ultimate objective of the kind of world in which we in the United States wish to live and wish everybody else to live.

The bill has some imperfections, and I think it could be very materially improved if these imperfections were dealt with. Those which I feel are the most outstanding are the absence of any statute of limitations as to deportation of lawfully admitted aliens, and the Western Hemisphere numerical limitation.

As to the former, as the Attorney General has told us, and as our report states, he will give that matter careful study and will report to us about it, and the committee will be free to do something about it next year.

This is a bill to deal with the national origins quota system. Many of us on the committee feel that, at long last, we ought to get rid of it; and if inherent internal improvements in the procedure under the law are deemed to be required—and they certainly are required—we ought to deal with those next year and hold hearings on them. I hope this will be possible.

Secondly, the new Western Hemisphere numerical limitation is of great concern, not only as to what it does, as a matter of immediate concern, to our relations with our neighbors in the Americas both to the north and to the south, but for what it may do if used as a propaganda tool after it has become law, as undoubtedly it will.

There is no doubt that whatever we do with this measure in the Senate, it will be in conference between the Senate and the House of Representatives and these views may be reflected there.

For those reasons, Mr. President, I think both of the matters I have stated require full consideration before bringing the measure to a vote, and I hope the conferees will study the Western Hemisphere limitation most seriously.

Under the heading "Other matters," in the committee report, Senators will find reference to other matters raised by members of the committee in regard to section 214(c) which will be looked into between now and next year.

The bill, in its general thrust, is long overdue. It corrects one of the most glaring injustices on the statute books. It eliminates, at long last, a statute which, seeks to bar people from this country because of ethnic origin to the bill's passage which appears imminent, will be a blessing to the Nation and its honor and conscience.

I join with the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], a member of the committee who preceded me in his kind sentiments for those who have so long fought this issue of immigration reform, and have been so influential in bringing it out of committee. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], who is in charge of the bill, has performed most outstanding and yeoman service in long, arduous, and exhaustive hearings, sit-

ting through them day after day. It was my privilege to attend a good many of the hearings myself, though not nearly as many as he did, and the Senate is very much in his debt for his efforts in bringing the bill to the floor.

The same is true of the Senate from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], though I do not agree with certain of the views upon which he insisted. He, also, participated most actively and with great diligence and interest in the hearings day after day, exhaustively questioning the witnesses, and then, when a bill was proposed which came reasonably close to his views, did not engage in any stubborn opposition to it, but cooperated fully once he had made his basic point on the Western Hemisphere limitation in bringing the bill to the floor.

I speak in the same regard of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], who similarly cooperated in enabling us, at long last, to get a bill out of committee. The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], who has already spoken, rendered yeoman service also in this regard, as did the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott].

No list of those who fought hard for this effort, including every member of the Judiciary Committee who voted to report out the bill, could exclude the distinguished name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], who for a very long time has worked diligently toward this end. I say to the present occupant of the Chair [Mr. Kennedy of New York], with whom I had the honor of participating in a recent public discussion on the achievements of the Congress, that I was delighted with the great eloquence and conviction with which he spoke concerning the immigration bill.

So, Mr. President, I am hopeful of getting the relatively vital but very important aspects of this matter behind us in one fashion or another. Where I take exception to what is in the bill as it stands, I am hopeful that we may pass the bill soon and join the House of Representatives in bring the matter to conference. I regard the measure as the most historic immigration reform in this country in 40 years, this time on the constructive side, on the right side, rather than as, in 1924, on the restrictive, and discriminatory side.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I commend the Senator from New York for the great work that he has done in the field of immigration legislation. I know very well of his deep interest in the problems of immigration. He has been an outspoken opponent of the national origins quota system during the entire time of his membership in this body. In expressing my own appreciation, I know I speak on behalf of all the members of the committee, for his attendance at the hearings, in which he was diligent, and for the great work that he performed in the subcommittee and the full committee, and in seeing that the legislation came out on the floor. He has been interested, he has been concerned, he has

been in attendance at the hearings. He has raised a number of extremely important questions; and I believe, from the dialog which took place in the hearings, of both the subcommittee and the full committee, that the bill is a better one because of his actions. I commend him for his interest, his participation, and his help.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to the Senator from Massachusetts. I hope our efforts will bear the fruit I feel they deserve.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I see the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell] in the Chamber, and I understand that he wishes to take the floor. I should like to ask him at this time if it would be inconvenient for him if I called up my amendment and took 10 minutes to explain it.

Mr. PELL. There is absolutely no inconvenience to me; I am glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator very much for his courtesy.

AMENDMENT NO. 457

Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 457 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment (No. 457) offered by Mr. ALLOTT is as follows:

On page 59, after line 15, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 25. (a) The second proviso of section 212(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (75 Stat. 535; 8 U.S.C. 1182(e)) is amended to read as follows: 'Provided further, That (1) upon the favorable recommendation of the Secretary of State, pursuant to the request of an interested United States Government agency, or of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization after he has determined that departure from the United States would impose exceptional hardship upon the alien's spouse or child (if such spouse or child is a citizen of the United States or a lawful resident alien), or (2) upon written notification by the government of the country of which the alien is a citizen or national, advising the Attorney General that it has no objection to the alien's remaining in the United States without departure therefrom, the Attorney General may waive the requirement of such two-year foreign residence abroad in the case of any alien whose admission to the United States is found by the Attorney General to be in the public interest.'"

"(b) The amendment made by this section shall apply to any person who, prior to or after the effective date of this section, (1) acquired exchange visitor status under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, or (2) acquired or acquires exchange visitor status within the purview of section 101(a)(15)(J)."

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, my amendment is directed to section

23586

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 20, 1965

212(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. That section of the act is concerned with the exchange visitors who come here under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a definition of the term "exchange visitor."

There being no objection, the definition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFINITION OF TERM "EXCHANGE VISITOR"

The term includes "students, trainees, teachers, instructors, professors * * * leaders, experts in fields of specialized knowledge or skill, and other influential or distinguished persons * * * performing artists and athletes." (22 U.S.C. 2452.)

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, section 212(e) requires that such exchange visitors leave the United States for a period of at least 2 years before they may be eligible to apply for an immigrant visa or to apply for permanent residence in the United States.

There are two exceptions in section 212(e) where the Attorney General may, if he finds it to be in the public interest, waive the requirement of the 2 years of foreign residence. The first of these is:

Upon the favorable recommendation of the Secretary of State, pursuant to the request of an interested U.S. Government agency.

Waivers granted under this exception are very, very few. I have a memorandum of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, revised in March of 1961, which states that the Department has adopted a stringent and a restrictive policy with respect to requesting waivers for foreign exchange visitors. That policy, I believe, continues in effect today.

The second exception permits a waiver if the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization determines that departure from the United States would impose "exceptional hardship" upon the alien's spouse or child.

This exceptional hardship provision is also very restrictively construed. Probably all Senators have, at one time or another, become familiar with a case where an alien has applied for a waiver of the 2-year foreign residence requirement, on the basis of exceptional hardship. It is clear that the Immigration and Naturalization Service will not permit such waiver on the bare fact of separation of a man from his family, nor on the fact that the family otherwise must go to the foreign land with the alien, where customs and language may be unknown to that family. Even health problems, which would better be treated if the individual were to remain in the United States, may not be considered exceptional hardship meriting waiver of the foreign residence requirement.

My amendment, Mr. President, would add another exception upon which a waiver of the 2-year foreign residence requirement might be based. The amendment would make a moderate, but important revision in section 212(e) by permitting waiver if the country of which the alien is a national or citizen advises the Attorney General in writing that it

does not demand or insist upon the alien's return to that country. The Attorney General still would have discretion in the approval of requests for such waiver and would be required, before approving the waiver, to find that it was in the public interest.

The basic purpose, of course, for the 2-year foreign residence requirement is to protect the integrity of the exchange program. This is the reason also for the restrictive interpretation placed on the waiver provisions. In reviewing the legislative history of section 212(e), I found that some countries were threatening to withdraw from the exchange program because their citizens, who had come as exchange visitors, were attempting to remain here. In response, we enacted the 2-year requirement which, in effect, promised those countries participating in the exchange program, that their citizens would return to them for a stipulated period of time before allowing them to return to the United States.

But what of the individual who has come here as an exchange visitor, who desires to remain here, who could contribute much to our culture and whose own government has no particular desire to see him return? It seems wholly unnecessary for those people to be forced to depart and their forced departure adds absolutely nothing to the spirit, purpose, and intent of the law under which they came here. The change I propose here simply adds the latitude necessary to equitably resolve such cases, while still maintaining the integrity of the exchange act.

Mr. President, I would have thought that such an obvious problem might have been handled administratively under present law. Such, however, is not the case. My attention was called to this unfortunate fact in 1963, when many citizens of Gunnison, Colo., called on me to see if I could prevent the deportation of a young Chinese lady who had come here as an exchange visitor. She had married here and the couple had a child. She had become an integral part of that community and the citizens were most incensed that she might be forced to return to Taiwan. I was told also that the Chinese Government had no objection to her remaining here. At my suggestion she got a written statement from the Chinese Embassy here confirming that fact. All this was to no avail. The agencies concerned in our Government told me they had no discretion under section 212(e) and that even though the young lady was both wife and mother of American citizens and even though her own government had no objection to her remaining here—even though she was a trained nurse, which is a critical category in this country—she was told that she would be required to leave the country for the 2-year period before she could become a resident here. Fortunately, the deportation proceedings have been delayed, but the threat is still present.

There is one other aspect of the problem. As the Senator from Massachusetts knows, the Judiciary Committees of both the House and the Senate have established a firm policy against granting

waivers of the foreign residence requirement for exchange students. I would not argue with that policy, but I would represent, just as strongly as I can, that some avenue of relief should be open to worthy aliens in circumstances such as I have described.

I might mention, too, that after I introduced a bill in 1963, similar to the amendment I proposed today to change section 212(e), I received letters from many parts of the country expressing hope that the law could be changed. I found the case with which I was concerned was by no means an isolated one. I find on page 20969 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 25 a discussion by several Members of the other body in which exactly the same sort of cases are involved.

There are countries which participate in the exchange program which are overpopulated or which have no real need nor opportunity to utilize the skills which their citizens may obtain here, and those countries have no objection to the exchange student remaining here. The young lady in Gunnison had become a nurse, and as Senators know, nurses are in short supply in this country and we are doing all we can to increase their number. Yet, we will not permit exchange students with all these equities to remain here.

One more point, Mr. President, H.R. 2580 embodies two principal concepts to replace the national origins quota system. The primary emphasis is on uniting or reuniting families. The second emphasis is on admitting those immigrants who can contribute most to our society. I am in sympathy with those objectives and my amendment is fully in accord with them. The case which led me to submit the amendment is illustrative. If a waiver could be given in this case, we would be preserving a family intact and acquiring for ourselves one with particular skills in short supply in our country, while subtracting not one iota from the purposes and integrity of the exchange act.

Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, and I am still hopeful that he will be able to relent and accept my amendment. However, he has explained to me that he has some problems in this respect.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. First of all, let me commend the Senator for his expression of confidence in the general outline of the proposed legislation. His support is meaningful. I also commend the Senator for his concern over a matter which has been brought to the attention of the members of the subcommittee a number of times. It has also been brought to the attention of the Department of Justice, and the Secretary of State. It is a matter in which I am in deep sympathy with the Senator from Colorado.

I believe that every Member of the Senate has had, at one time or another, the kind of cases which the Senator from Colorado has outlined here this afternoon, and in many instances they have served as a source of injustice to people who are in the United States, who could make a contribution to this country.

September 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23587

One of the matters raised by the amendment of the Senator from Colorado relates to scholarships and grants which are given individuals who come from foreign countries under our aid programs to the various nations. The scholarships are made available under the general disposition of funds under foreign aid to persons who have promise, who have ability, and who can substantially benefit their countries by coming to the United States and taking advantage of our educational and other institutions.

I understand that the concept behind such a program is to provide an opportunity to young people who have talent, and who can make some contributions to their country. The United States pays for many of these students, with the rather clear indication that these individuals would return to benefit the countries from which they come.

I understand the point being made by the Senator from Colorado. If the country from which they come is willing to make a statement that those persons are not needed there, and we determine that they can contribute to the national interest by staying in this country, they should be permitted to do so.

Although I am in general sympathy with the Senator from Colorado, I would feel, before taking a position on this question, that probably we should have at least some kind of attitude expressed by the Secretary of State, who is intimately involved in this whole undertaking with respect to the availability of aid funds and the implications of such an amendment on our foreign policy. However, I am in sympathy with the general theme and the approach of the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I dislike to interrupt the Senator, but he is entirely correct that this is the purpose of the exchange program. It causes us all a great deal of concern. Actually, the purpose is to help other countries upgrade their technical capabilities, so their citizens who come to this country can go home and be able to help those countries.

I know that this is not an easy area. It is a very complicated area.

I believe the Senator would agree that the amendment I have offered places limitations which are rather strict and severe. First, a waiver would only be granted upon the recommendation of the Secretary of State at the request of an interested U.S. Government agency, or the Commissioner of Immigration after a finding of exceptional hardship, or upon written notification of the country, advising the Attorney General that it has no objection to the alien remaining in the United States. Then the Attorney General may waive the foreign residence requirement, but even in that case it is within his discretion. So in the particular amendment which I have offered, I believe the Senator would agree, would he not, that we have tried to prohibit the category of exchange visitors from coming under the program and simply staying on. There are rather stringent con-

ditions which a person would have to fulfill before the laws were waived.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I agree with the Senator from Colorado. Even if the amendment were included in the legislation, there are other regulations which would apply, giving flexibility to the Attorney General before making a final determination in such questions. I believe that is true.

As I have said, I am in general sympathy with the objectives and spirit of this amendment. I, too, have seen similar cases of individuals who have come here. I mentioned in my original remarks that many students come here under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961. I am sure those students could come to this country to attend a university or college on other scholarships which would be available to them, and not be involved in these aid programs. This fact would seem to give greater authority to the suggestions made by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. In the House of Representatives, as appears on page 20969 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 25, 1965, Mr. FEIGHAN stated as follows. He was asked if this question would be dealt with in the coming session of Congress. He said:

Very definitely; we intend to go into that as expeditiously as possible. We have been consuming our time of course to a great extent on the bill presently under consideration, but the gentleman can be assured that we will take that up before this session of the Congress adjourns.

May I inquire of the Senator from Massachusetts what his attitude or disposition would be in reference to these matters coming up at the first of the year, as they should, and toward giving consideration—I am not asking him to commit himself, but I am talking about giving consideration and study—to this type of legislation.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Of course, I would have to consult with the chairman of the subcommittee, of which I am a member—I have been acting chairman—but it has been my understanding, in conversations which I have had with the Attorney General and with the State Department, that they are reviewing not only the question which has been raised by the Senator from Colorado, but related problems, and that they are going to make suggestions in the form of omnibus legislation, to be studied by the committee next year.

I would hope that the area which has been suggested by the Senator from Colorado would be an area on which the committee would have hearings and listen to the attitudes which would be expressed on this particular problem, so it might have some understanding and comprehension of them. If that were done, I think it would be very useful. The fact that the Senator from Colorado has raised the question puts an additional burden on the members of the committee to make sure it is done.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator in charge of the bill. With the assurances he has just given me, I am quite satisfied with the time element. I understand, from pre-

vious conversations with the Senator this afternoon, that those concerned with the bill are anxious not to inject these somewhat collateral issues into the issue of this particular bill. I can sympathize with that point of view.

Mr. President, because of the assurances that have been given with respect to going into this matter, not only by the statement of the chairman in the House of Representatives, but also here from the Senator in charge of the bill, I shall withdraw my amendment.

I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], who yielded his place on the floor in order that I might have an opportunity to offer my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] withdraws his amendment.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PELL. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one of the most distressing shortcomings in our immigration laws, as they relate to aliens residing in the United States, is the absence of any time limitation on the institution of deportation proceedings.

It is an established principle of law that justice requires a time limit within which authorities must commence proceedings against an individual for any alleged crime. The reason for the statute of limitation principle as a basic element of justice is simply the heavy burden that is placed upon an accused person in locating witnesses and evidence after the lapse of many years.

It is hard enough for the Government, with its many resources, to locate witnesses and evidence after 25 to 30 years have passed. But the resources of the Federal Government are virtually bottomless, if it decides to go to the expense of prosecuting such a case.

For the defendant, a reasonable defense can be almost impossible.

So in the case of the criminal code, we have a time limit within which a person must be prosecuted, and after which he may not. The only exceptions to this rule are usually capital cases.

Yet in the case of actions for which deportation proceedings may be brought, there is no time limit. These actions may not even be of so serious a nature that a criminal prosecution is possible.

Yet the Immigration Service is able to institute proceedings by reason of actions that it alleges took place far in excess of a time limit that would apply to a criminal prosecution.

Two cases in my own State, wherein proceedings for deportation were brought some 25 to 30 years after the alleged acts took place aroused my interest in what I found to be a serious shortcoming in the administration of justice. Other Senators have learned of similar situations affecting their constituents.

One case was shocking and aroused many people in my State, particularly the lawyers in my State.

It is known as the Mackie case. It involves a baby born in Finland, whose

parents were naturalized American citizens and who had gone back to Finland for a visit. At the age of 6 months, he was brought to the United States. His associates were in the United States during his whole lifetime. During the depression in the 1930's, he attended various meetings which subsequently were described by the immigration authorities to be at least Communist-dominated meetings, although we have the sworn affidavit that at no time was Mackie a member of the Communist Party, and that he attended meetings which he was led to believe were meetings that would help the unemployed get employment.

More than 20 years later, the immigration authorities, under the administrative processes and immigration procedures, ordered him to be deported.

He is over in Finland today. He has no friends there. His relatives are remote. He was unable to speak the Finnish language. In my State of Oregon, in the city of Portland, this man had led an exemplary life as a family man and had raised a family. He was a house painter. No crime had been charged against him. However, because during that particular era we had a concern and hysteria about people belonging to leftwing organizations, or because they had attended leftwing meetings, and the use by the immigration authorities of typical stool pigeons who testified at the administrative hearings, but not before a jury, this man was deported.

Let me say to the American people that that is one reason why the senior Senator from Oregon in 20 years of service in this body has protested this kind of injustice, under which people are in fact sentenced, but outside the field of criminal law protection.

I am glad that according to the note that has just been handed to me, this was done in the Kennedy administration or by the present Presiding Officer of the Senate [Mr. KENNEDY, of New York in the chair], who was Attorney General during the Kennedy administration, but that it was done prior to that time.

I am thinking about the principle that is involved. I do not care under what administration it arises. The basic principle of fair trial in the United States is too precious to have run roughshod over by the U.S. immigration authorities.

I say to those Americans who have a tendency to brush these matters aside, that it means a lot of difference if they or one of their's become involved.

As the senior Senator from Oregon, it is my obligation to rise up, in justice, wherever I find certain practices by the immigration authorities or anybody else.

The time is long overdue when the immigration organization of the U.S. Government should be brought under some checks and balance controls, and subjected to the basic principles of fair procedure guaranteeing Americans the protection from the kind of harassment and penalty Mackie was subjected to.

Mackie is over in Finland removed from his family, on the basis of a charge that immigration authorities never established before a jury. He was supposed to be a Communist sympathizer.

Senators know what we should have done, with the power of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Mackie was brought over here at age 6 months, legally admitted. He grew up and lived in an American environment. It was an American environment that produced him.

When I think of all the authorities we have for the proper surveillance of this person, I am not at all moved by the administrative ruling of the immigration authorities that such a person could become a danger to the body politic of the United States. Shame on us, to think we could be guilty of such an injustice to a human being.

I cite this as an example of what can and does go on in the Immigration Service without a statute of limitations.

The senior Senator from Oregon is pleading for a statute of limitations, and he is pleading with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] to take his amendment to conference because it is an eminently fair amendment and ought to go to conference, and we ought to write it on the statute books.

I see on the floor the great former Attorney General of the State of New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Senator JAVITS included in his immigration bill of 1963, a bill I joined him in cosponsoring, a 10-year limitation on the bringing of these proceedings. Also in 1963, I introduced my own measure, S. 1500, imposing a 5-year limit on the bringing of proceedings for deportation or loss of nationality. I used 5 years in my bill because that is the standard for federal crimes.

But in 1963, I also introduced, with Senator HART as a cosponsor, S. 1501, which sought to approach the matter differently by prohibiting deportation proceedings from being brought against any person who was lawfully admitted for permanent residence before his 14th birthday, and establishing a 10-year limitation for all other cases. The objective of this bill was to consider that young people who lawfully entered the country before the age of 14 should not be subject to deportation at all.

The several bills introduced in the last 10 years on this subject, and I have mentioned only a few of them, indicate considerable interest in the subject among Members of Congress. Although the subject matter does not affect as many as does the obnoxious national origins quota, it is nonetheless a bad provision of law and deserves to be remedied.

Page 26 of the report of the Senate Judiciary Committee states, and I quote:

As previously indicated, the instant bill does not embody a comprehensive revision of the Immigration and Nationality Act. However, the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization did give consideration to many proposals contained in other bills pending before the subcommittee which would have amended the Immigration and Nationality Act in other respects. Included in the suggested changes were proposals to establish a Board of Visa Appeals and to establish a statute of limitations in deportation cases. In the course of the subcommittee's consideration of those two proposals, it was indicated by the Attorney General that

while he did not think it appropriate at this time to institute such changes without further study, he expressed his willingness to undertake a complete study of the proposals, to discuss the desirability of the establishment of a Board of Visa Appeals with the Secretary of State and to report seasonably on the above matters.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not know of many other provisions in this immigration law that is quite as offensive to law, leaving aside political sciences, as the failure to have a statute of limitations. The Senator pointed out one glaring inequity.

There have been cases of people who, on the threat of deportation, had heart attacks, who had been in this country for 30 to 35 years; following the deportable offense.

The Attorney General has again—and, we will hold him to it—agreed to bring us back a report on this procedural change so that we can act on it. One reason offered for not supporting the statute of limitations by the Department of Justice is that it is a procedural change, and we are dealing primarily in this bill with a change in the national origins system.

I do not blame the Senator from Oregon a bit for offering this amendment now and pressing it. I can understand his reason perfectly. Perhaps I am not so free to do it as he is, because he is not a member of the committee. He has had a similar experience when he has been in a position of authority with respect to a certain bill. This was a difficult bill to get out of committee, and we had given some ground to get it out.

I have studied the subject carefully. It is really one of the most depressing, deplorable, unjust aspects of law that I, as a lawyer, interested in due process, have seen on the statute books of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from New York. No one has fought harder to remedy this injustice than the senior Senator from New York, as evidenced by the legislation that he has introduced, and to which I have already referred.

But one cannot study these cases without rending his heart. It is heartbreaking to think that our Government should perpetrate shocking injustices upon human beings merely because they happen to be of alien birth. Senators have heard me say before, and I shall say so again this afternoon, that, after all, the test of a democratic form of government is whether it is always willing to deal with individual injustices that any of its processes or procedures create.

Whenever this Government becomes so complex, so big, or so cold in the administration of its affairs that it will not pay attention to human injustices, the American people had better watch out for their freedoms. The senior Senator from Oregon is talking this afternoon about a basic liberty, without which men are not free—that is, a fair trial.

September 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23589

There is nothing fair or just about the procedures of the U.S. Immigration Service in this respect. I regret that the administrators of the U.S. Immigration Service, for years past, have not come before Congress to ask that they be shorn of this arbitrary, discretionary power they have exercised to the injustice of human beings. What do they fall back on? They say that the law permits it; that the law authorizes them to act in that way. That is always a good escape hatch for one to practice arbitrary, capricious power. The Senator from Oregon favors the sealing of that escape hatch. The Senator from Oregon is making a plea that we give to human beings, be they immigrants or natural born citizens, a fair trial to determine whether there is justification for deporting them.

A fair trial cannot be had without a statute of limitations. We know that basic in Anglo-Saxon justice is the guarantee of a limitation upon the prosecution powers of the government. We also know that a statute of limitations is essential if we really and truly are to implement the presumption of innocence doctrine.

The trouble with the Immigration Service in many cases is that it proceeds on the presumption of guilt; and because Congress has not included basic legal protections for a fair trial, the duty then is upon the one accused to prove his innocence. That procedure cannot be justified. That is why I am urging the favorable consideration of my amendment.

I have quoted the present Attorney General, who, I think by clear implication, recognizes my plea as highly meritorious, when he says—and the committee quotes him—that he will take this matter under study and submit a report in the future.

Mr. President, I do not think we can wait. I gather that it can be assumed from what the Attorney General has said that he will make a recommendation of his own in the near future on the subject of a limitation of immigration proceedings. I regret that he has not made such a recommendation before this. I do not know why he has not; he has known about the problem. The injustices have been perpetrated over and over again for more than a decade; since, in fact, the statute of limitations that existed before 1952 was repealed. That was a 5-year statute comparable with the one I have proposed in my bill S. 1500, that we return to.

I am offering my amendment today because I do not believe the responsibility can be left entirely to the Department of Justice. The initial responsibility lies with Congress. We originally imposed the limitation; then in 1952 we repealed it. It is up to Congress to reestablish it.

Senators have undoubtedly received from the American Civil Liberties Union a memorandum on this subject. It is headed "Proposed Statute of Limitations on Deportation." It begins with a proposed amendment to the pending bill. However, the language I am offering now is not the language suggested in the memorandum of the American Civil

Liberties Union, but is the text of my bill S. 1500, of the 88th Congress. Nevertheless, the impact of the language is the same.

The remainder of the memorandum is an excellent exposition of the background of limitations on deportation proceedings. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the bar associations, and the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization which reported in 1953, have been highly critical of the absence of this limitation.

We just heard a statement by the former attorney general of the State of New York, but large numbers of leaders of the bar across this country share the view of the senior Senator from Oregon. They have written to me in the last several years in support of a statute of limitations to be added to our body of immigration law.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. ERVIN. The committee sat from February until a few weeks ago conducting hearings on the bill, and this problem was never investigated. Does not the Senator from Oregon agree with the Senator from North Carolina that it would be a more proper procedure for the Senator from Oregon to submit his amendment for reference to the committee, and to let hearings be conducted on both sides of the question before Congress takes action? The Senator's amendment was not offered during the hearings.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from North Carolina is quite correct. That would be preferable. But I do not know why the delightful senior Senator from North Carolina, one of the most distinguished Members of this body and a former justice of the North Carolina Supreme Court, recognizing the hole in the bill, did not offer the amendment himself, or apprise the senior Senator from Oregon of the fact that this problem was before the committee.

I say to the Senator quite frankly that, considering the multitude of things that my complex life causes me to deal with in the Senate, this is one of the things which has slipped by me. I am very sorry that it has. However, now that I see the problem, that would not relieve me of my responsibility of offering the amendment.

This is nothing new. The Committee on the Judiciary is rather well aware of the views of the senior Senator from Oregon. I have offered amendments and bills before which have been before the Committee on the Judiciary, and so have many other Senators. I offered a private bill in the Mackie case. The bill was before the Committee on the Judiciary.

I say to my good friend, the Senator from North Carolina, that I am exceedingly disappointed that the members on

the Committee on the Judiciary have not heretofore reported the Mackie bill from the committee. However, I believe it is important that the senior Senator from Oregon raise the question this afternoon.

I am not naive. I am not blind as to what my parliamentary situation is. However, I hope that we can get some understanding or agreement now.

I was directing my remarks to the Senator in charge of the bill, the junior Senator from Massachusetts. I hope that we can get some understanding from the committee. I know that the policy is to add no amendments to the bill. I hope that we can have an understanding that the amendment will be taken to conference, or that we can have some hearings on the problem come January.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I tell the senior Senator from Oregon, as a member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, and as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary itself, that I shall try to obtain speedy hearings on an amendment of this nature.

Several years ago I attended a hearing of the Committee on the Judiciary which caused me to believe that perhaps there may be something to be said in opposition to a statute of limitations.

We had a hearing on an amendment providing a rule of estoppel and a rule of res adjudicata in immigration matters. We found that the king of the underworld—the boss of the underworld in New Orleans—had successfully fought deportation for something like 14 or 15 years. Every time the authorities were about to deport him, he would obtain another writ of habeas corpus from a different Federal judge.

The United States was powerless to deport from the country a man who, in large measure, was corrupting the city of New Orleans and its environs.

Mr. MORSE. They were not powerless to place him in prison.

Mr. ERVIN. They could not have him deported. He had a multitude of habeas corpus writs issued, and, under the rule, neither res adjudicata nor deportation was applicable.

If my recollection serves me correctly, I believe that the present occupant of the chair, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] was serving as Attorney General of the United States at that time and has some familiarity with the problem.

I say to the senior Senator from Oregon that I believe a good case can be made for the proposition that, if a man comes to America illegally and engages in underworld activities, he ought not to have the benefit of a simple statute of limitations.

I agree that if a man comes here illegally and becomes a useful member of society and can show that fact, he ought not to be deported. Under the bill as amended at the instance of the able and distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii and I, a man who comes here illegally and becomes a useful and good citizen can acquire permanent residence here and eventual citizenship. However,

23590

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 20, 1965

I assure the senior Senator from Oregon that I shall do all I can do to obtain a speedy consideration of the bill by the subcommittee and by the committee.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to inform the Senator of what occurred. I think it has very great bearing on the assurance which is most gratifyingly given by the Senator from North Carolina. I offered the statute of limitation as a part of the bill (S. 1093) I introduced last February and again in the subcommittee as an amendment and proposed to submit this very limitation to which the Senator has referred as an amendment on the floor. In our informal discussions in the committee, as is quite understandable in view of the fact that any amendment of this character, if agreed to, would very materially delay the passage of the legislation, I refrained from actually pressing it to a vote in the interest of getting prompt and favorable action on the bill. That was the reason for the assurance which we had from the Attorney General and which is specifically referred to at page 26 of the report.

I should like to join my distinguished colleague who, I think on the whole, in view of his views concerning this type of legislation, has really strained to try to join with us in an effort to secure passage of this legislation.

I assure the senior Senator from Oregon that, whatever he may do on this matter—and I shall vote with him, as I said—he has one indefatigable fighter trying to get this done as a lawyer, without any regard to what one thinks of the immigration law.

I believe that the Senator from Oregon was correct in saying what he did to the Senator from North Carolina. We may very well find a great ally by virtue of this very thing, because it is the kind of thing that is very offensive to a lawyer. I believe that the Senator from North Carolina, whatever may be our difference of view, in some areas is a lawyer's lawyer.

I join the Senator and assure him that I shall move heaven and earth to obtain action.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina knows my record of handling legislation and facing up to the parliamentary realities in the Senate and cooperating to work out the best adjustment possible.

I have had cooperation from the Senator from North Carolina in connection with some education amendments. The Senator will recall that when we had a so-called judicial review amendment, he urged a vote on the judicial review amendment. I was hoping that he would not, but he had a perfect right to do that, and the amendment did go to a vote. The opposition prevailed, not because we were opposed to a judicial review, but because we felt that, under the parliamentary situation which existed on the floor of the Senate, it was a mistake to jeopardize the interest of the education bill itself by adding to it the judicial review amendment of the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from

Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. But after his amendment was defeated, to the great credit of the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Kentucky, they cooperated completely with me as chairman of that committee, and as the Senator in charge of that bill, in the handling of the judicial review amendment.

I deeply regret—and it is not the fault of the Senator from North Carolina—that the Morse judicial review bill, co-sponsored subsequently by the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Kentucky and others, has not yet come to a hearing.

Arguing by analogy, I believe that the amendment which I offer now, and which I shall subsequently offer as a bill this afternoon if it is not accepted, should come to an early hearing before the Committee on the Judiciary next January. However, I urge again, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, that the Morse-Ervin-Cooper-Clark judicial review measure should come to a hearing before the Committee on the Judiciary this coming January. These vital matters should not be postponed. We ought to get on to a hearing.

Of course, I am fully aware of the parliamentary situation that confronts me. The senior Senator from Oregon will not be a party this afternoon to jeopardizing the passage of this immigration bill. The heart of the immigration bill, as far as I am concerned, is, of course, the national origins feature of it. I believe that it is important that we get the measure passed.

As I say, if I am unable to have this amendment agreed to and taken to conference by voluntary agreement, then I shall withdraw the amendment and introduce it this afternoon as a bill and send it to the desk as a separate bill, and leave it at the desk until Friday of this week at 5 p.m. for any who want to co-sponsor the measure with me. We can then let it go to the Committee on the Judiciary in the hope that there will be hearings on it early in the next session of Congress.

I would not want the RECORD to stand on the argument of the Senator from North Carolina without any comment by the senior Senator from Oregon on what I think is not a sound argument, which has been made by the Senator from North Carolina by way of opposition to the statute of limitations.

I have been impressed by the argument of the Justice Department and the immigration authorities, in particular, that there should not be any statute of limitations available in the cases of the underworld characters who may be of alien birth, who have gotten into this country.

What we ought to do is convict them and put them in prison, like any other criminals. Even these unsavory characters are in no small measure the product of our own conditioning. I do not wish to believe, and I refuse to believe, that the only way we can handle criminals who did not happen to be born in this country is to deport them. I do not believe we should deport such people

to any other country. I think we should convict them and put them in prison, where they belong. That is my answer.

But even those unsavory characters, in my judgment, from the point of view of fair dealing with human beings, are entitled to a statute of limitations. They are entitled to have the Government proceed against them within the period of time called for by my proposed statute of limitations. If they are not proved guilty within that period of time, then we should deal with their guilt, if any subsequently develops after the running of the statute of limitations, convict them, and put them in prison.

Be that as it may. I would point out to the Senator from North Carolina that my amendment affects only aliens who were lawfully admitted, not those who entered illegally.

Before I last yielded to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], I was making the point that bar associations, leading lawyers, lawyers on various law enforcement councils, and even representatives of judicial councils, have deplored the very weakness in the administration of the immigration laws about which I have been speaking this afternoon.

I agree with the Senator from North Carolina. In an appropriate hearing in the early part of next year, I shall marshal that opinion evidence. I shall also marshal whatever documentation is available in support of my bill. The Senator from North Carolina may be sure I shall be in the front row the morning he opens his hearings, asking to be recognized as witness.

I repeat, as I close these remarks, that I believe the amendment I intended to offer is a sound and desirable one. It would not relate to anyone who entered the country in violation of the immigration laws. It would safeguard illegally admitted persons from being deported, and from having loss of citizenship proceedings brought for acts said to have been committed but which may have occurred 15, 20 or 30 years ago. I do not believe longtime residents of the United States should be subjected to what I consider to be this grossly unfair treatment, and therefore I plead with the Senate to give favorable consideration to such amendment, although I would not deny my friend, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] an opportunity either to accept or reject the amendment and take it to conference. I am merely asking him to tell me what he would do should I offer it. I should not press for a vote, if the Senator felt in good faith he could not take it to conference. It may very well be that the Senator may see some advantage in taking it to conference, to get the conference reaction to it, and, if rejected there, it could be considered as a bill later.

On the other hand, if the Senator tells me he thinks it would be a mistake to take it to conference, I shall not even offer it as an amendment to the bill, but send it to the desk and ask to have it appropriately referred. In such event I shall ask that it remain at the desk until 5 p.m. this coming Friday, for cosponsors.

EXHIBIT I

PROPOSED STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS ON DEPORTATION (MEMORANDUM OF CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION AMENDMENT)

(A) PRESENT SITUATION

1. For 65 years prior to the 1952 law there had been a statute of limitations on deportation proceedings. From 1917 there was a general 5-year period of limitations for bringing deportation proceedings after improper entry, except for:

- (a) deportable offenses committed in the United States;
- (b) subversive aliens; and
- (c) entry in violation of quota requirements or with improper visa.

2. Under the 1952 act, all statutes of limitations are eliminated, and deportation proceedings can be brought at any time, no matter how remote from the improper entry (sec. 241).

(a) Although there is no period of limitations whatsoever for bringing deportation proceedings, in three instances the statute specifies that the ground of deportation must have occurred "within 5 years after entry": institutionalization at public expense for mental disease (sec. 241(a)(3)), public charge (sec. 241(a)(8)), conviction of violations of the provisions of title I of the Alien Registration Act of 1940 (sec. 241(a)(15)).

(b) The 1952 act retroactively eliminated previous statutes of limitations (sec. 241(d)).

(B) PURPOSE AND OPERATION OF STATUTES OF LIMITATIONS

1. Statutes of limitations have a twofold purpose, to protect innocent persons from prosecution of claims at a time when evidence in defense is not available, and to spare the courts from litigation of stale claims "after memories have faded, witnesses died or disappeared, and evidence lost" *Chase Securities Corp. v. Donaldson*, 325 U.S. 304, 314 (1944).

2. Under the Federal criminal law, a general 5-year statute of limitations is applicable to crimes not punishable by death, 18 U.S.C. 2382. Arson, robbery, burglary, forgery, white slave traffic, assault with a deadly weapon, and larceny are punishable only if proceedings are instituted within 5 years.

3. Likewise, civil actions are subject to statutes of limitations of varying periods.

4. The Internal Security Act of 1950, §4(e), provided a 10-year statute of limitations for conspiracy to establish a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States under foreign domination or control.

5. Under the Federal criminal law, fraudulent procurement of citizenship or naturalization is subject to a 10-year statute of limitations 18 U.S.C. 3291.

6. In some countries an alien's admission for permanent residence exempts him from deportation (Peru). In Brazil, aliens who are married to citizens and who are responsible for the support of citizens may not be deported. The most common statute of limitations in foreign countries is a 5-year period. Canada grants this limitation to most offenses excepting subversives. Australia has a 5-year period with limited exceptions.

(C) RATIONALE FOR PRESENT LAW

The major report of the Senate Judiciary Committee leading to the enactment of the 1952 law justified the present provisions as follows:

"It is the recommendation of the subcommittee that the time limitation on their deportation after entry should be eliminated. If the cause for exclusion existed at the time of entry, it is believed that such aliens are just as undesirable at any subsequent time as they are within the 5 years after entry * * * all aliens who become public charges at any time after entry * * * should

be subject to deportation at any time" (S. Rept. No. 1515, 81st Cong., 2d sess., pp. 389-390).

(D) CONGRESSIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The House Committee on Immigration (79th Cong., 1st sess., H. Rept. No. 1312, p. 16) recommended a 10-year statute of limitations on deportation under the 1924 Immigration Act.

(E) RECOMMENDATIONS OF PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION

The President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization in its 1953 report had the following to say as to periods of limitations on deportation:

"That it is wrong to keep the threat of punishment indefinitely over the head of one who breaks the law is a principle deeply rooted in the ancient traditions of our legal system. The law requires that criminal prosecutions, except for capital offenses, such as murder and treason, be brought within a fixed period of time or not at all. A similar dispensation governs the enforcement of civil liabilities.

"Indeed, the 1952 statute retroactively rescind the limited statute of limitations fixed by previous law. An alien who entered the United States 25 years ago and whose entry involved a purely technical violation enjoyed immunity from deportation for the last 20 years. Under the 1952 act he is now again subject to deportation. The act threatens the security of many aliens and their families. Their immunities have been removed, and they may be torn out of their accustomed places in the communities in which they live, no matter how exemplary their conduct over a long period of years * * * the new act actually restores the threat of cruel and inhuman punishment for offenses long since forgiven.

"This undue severity is underscored by the fact that although prosecutions for aggravated criminal violations of the immigration laws are subject to a 3-year statute of limitations, deportation proceedings for such violations—as well as for infractions which offend no criminal law—are governed by no statute of limitations and may be brought—more than say 20 or 40 years after an alien entered the United States. No one has suggested any sound reason why the purpose of limitations—recognition of the unfairness involved in requiring a person to make a defense long after the event when it is difficult or impossible to assemble witnesses and evidence—does not apply to immigration matters at least with equal force as to prosecutions for serious crimes.

"It is said that the existence of a statute of limitations would encourage aliens to enter the United States in violation of the immigration laws. A person who enters or remains in the United States in violation of the immigration laws should be subject to deportation from the United States, but the consequences of such a violation should be enforced against him within a reasonable time. Their is a fundamental public purpose which is served by statutes of limitations for crimes and in civil actions. This is just as important an objective of law enforcement as the avoidance of violation of law" (pp. 197-198).

The Commission recommended "that the immigration statute should provide that a deportation proceeding may not be commenced against any alien more than 10 years after the violation occurred" (pp. 197-198).

(F) ANALYSIS OF SITUATION

1. Persons who have entered the United States illegally or who have improperly obtained naturalization should be subject to removal of the status so improperly attained;

2. But the absence of a statute of limitations covering deportation is an undesirable departure from basic principles of law. There is no valid reason for denying to such persons what is basic to our jurisprudence, protection from raking up old and dead issues after a reasonable period of time, after which memories of witnesses have faded, contemporaneous sources of information are no longer available, and the general peace of the community would be unduly upset. Under present law an alien can be deported for something that took place 50 years ago, even if it were only of a purely minor technical character. This means that people who have lived substantially their entire lives in the United States can be torn away from their families and sent to lands which are utterly foreign to them;

3. There is no showing whatsoever of a need for a change in the 65 year old practice of a statute of limitations for deportation;

4. The failure to provide for a reasonable period of limitations, after which deportation proceedings are based, is unjust, unwarranted, and contrary to the fundamental pattern of American law; and

5. In view of the present pattern of statutes of limitations in Federal law, a strong argument could be advanced for a 5 year statute of limitations for deportation. However, in view of the recommendations by a congressional committee and a Presidential Commission for a 10-year period, a 10-year statute of limitations for instituting deportation should be enacted.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I should be happy to cosponsor the bill the Senator says he will send to the desk.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is already a cosponsor.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. But I feel that the record on the matter of deportation has been established in the committee and it has been quite clear since the very earliest date when the Attorney General of the United States testified before the committee, that this matter merited further, real, consideration.

The Attorney General was subjected to considerable examination and questioning by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who has demonstrated great concern, not only on this matter, but on the establishment of a board of visa appeals, as well as by other members of the committee who have been concerned about the question of deportations and other matters affecting the basic rights of citizens, both naturalized and alien.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] has followed the hearings closely and has been deeply concerned about the question of deportation. He has spoken to me, and I know to other members of the committee. Many other Members of the Senate have likewise expressed their concern.

So I thank the Senator from Oregon for once more, as the senior Senator from New York has done earlier in the day, doing great service on the whole question by suggesting the need for active consideration in this area.

During the discussions and the mark-up in the subcommittee, we had assur-

ances from the Attorney General that this would be a matter of concern to his office, and should be a matter of concern to the members of the committee. Moreover, in the committee report, on page 26, under the title of "Other Matters," it is stated:

As previously indicated, the instant bill does not embody a comprehensive revision of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Certainly, Mr. President, if it did, the matters raised by the senior Senator from Oregon unquestionably would have to be considered and perhaps included. The report goes on to state:

However, the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization did give consideration to many proposals contained in other bills pending before the subcommittee which would have amended the Immigration and Nationality Act in other respects. Included in the suggested changes were proposals to establish a Board of Visa Appeals and to establish a statute of limitations in deportation cases. In the course of the subcommittee's consideration of those two proposals, it was indicated by the Attorney General that while he did not think it appropriate at this time to institute such changes without further study, he expressed his willingness to undertake a complete study of the proposals, to discuss the desirability of the establishment of a Board of Visa Appeals with the Secretary of State and to report seasonably on the above matters.

Mr. President, the Attorney General of the United States has written his views to me, and I should like to read into the Record at this point the body of his letter to me under date of September 16, 1965:

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: This is in response to your request for a statement summarizing my views on certain proposals for changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act. These proposals were, as you know, considered by the Senate Judiciary Committee but were not acted upon by it, partly, I believe, at my request.

None of the proposals in question relates to or would affect substantially either the numbers or the qualifications of persons to be admitted as immigrants. They deal, rather, with such subjects as procedure, review, deportation, citizenship, expatriation and the like.

As I indicated to the committee, it is my view and that of the administration that consideration of these proposals should be deferred until the next session of Congress. We therefore oppose them at this time.

It should be emphasized, however, that we do not necessarily oppose these proposals on the merits. We have always recognized that there are a number of areas within the general area of immigration and nationality law which are in need of review and reform. However, in view of the overriding importance of the reforms needed in our system of choosing prospective immigrants, the administration has believed that that problem should be dealt with first. The other areas in need of reform are in many respects difficult and complex, and we are still in the process of making the review and study needed to develop appropriate recommendations.

Since neither the executive branch nor the committees of the Congress have yet had an opportunity to formulate careful recommendations with respect to these matters, I am hopeful that the proposals to which you refer will not be pressed on the floor of the Senate, or, if pressed, will not be enacted

at this time. I can assure you, however, that we are very much interested in pursuing reforms in areas outside that covered by the present bill and will endeavor to have our studies completed and recommendations prepared in time for consideration at the next session of the Congress.

To me this letter indicates, as it did to other members of the committee who had been concerned about such questions, that an effort will be made by the administration to look to these various naturalization and deportation problems. Certainly we should not relinquish our responsibility on the matter, but the record has been established in the hearings held on the immigration bill, and I think the record has been made this afternoon, that this is a matter of concern to members of the committee, not only in general as presented by the Senator from Oregon, but also as deportation applies to those who came to this country as young children. I think perhaps that consideration is even more appealing.

But I say that it was the feeling of the committee that at this time we should take the Attorney General at his word, and anticipate these recommendations as matters to be considered during the next session of Congress.

Mr. MORSE. I say to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] that, as he knows, I shall cooperate with him completely, as I shall with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. I shall not offer the amendment. I shall now send to the desk a bill on behalf of myself and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and anyone else who wishes to join as cosponsor between now and Friday night at 5 o'clock. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The bill (S. 2546) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to impose a limitation upon the time for the institution of deportation proceedings, and a limitation upon the time for the loss of U.S. nationality introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by adding at the end of such title the following section:

"LIMITATION ON TIME OF COMMENCING DEPORTATION PROCEEDINGS"

"SEC. 293. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, any alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence shall not, on or after the date of the enactment of this section, be deported by reason of any conduct occurring more than ten years prior to the institution of deportation proceedings against him."

(b) Section 340 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (88 Stat. 260; 8 U.S.C. 1451) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(k) No proceeding shall be instituted under subsection (a) of this section more than ten years after a naturalized citizen has been admitted to citizenship."

Sec. 2. The table of contents of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by adding the following new item at the end of title II thereof:

"Sec. 293. Limitation on time of commencing deportation proceedings."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, between now and next January, I shall be open to persuasion for any further modification of the bill which, in its present form, I believe to be desirable. If it can be improved, I shall go along with the improvements, but I urge that there be early hearings on the bill at the next session of Congress.

I thank the Senator from New York, the Senator from Massachusetts, and the Senator from North Carolina for their cooperation in this discussion, and for giving me their assurances that they are willing to have the issue raised and testimony taken.

Mr. JAVITS. Let me say to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], who has shown a profound interest in this matter, that it is included in the omnibus bill, S. 1093, which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] was gracious enough to cosponsor with me.

I believe, with the assurances written into the bill by the distinguished members of the committee, that the Senator need have no doubt that his work with us this afternoon has had an excellent effect, and we are coming to grips with the problem.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from New York. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] is about to offer another proposal, in which I shall be happy to join as a cosponsor, because he has a proposal which in some respects is broader than mine. Therefore, I believe that between the two proposals, we focus the light of attention on practically every facet of the problem of what I consider to be gross injustice in the administration of our immigration laws.

Mr. ERVIN. As the Senator from Oregon undoubtedly knows, legislation pertaining to immigration always arouses a great deal of controversy on the part of organizations and individuals. Therefore, under the chairmanship of the junior Senator from Massachusetts, the subcommittee conducted many weeks of hearings and heard many individuals and organizations speak both for and against abolition of the national origins quota system.

We had to make decisions relative to changes in the immigration laws and matters of procedure; and the subcommittee reached the conclusion that it would be best, in order to get effective action, to have a bill which would be confined entirely to admission to the United States of immigrants for permanent residence and ultimate citizenship.

Therefore, the bill has been confined to that one field.

The Senator from New York, who has done much studying in this field, made a valuable contribution to the work of the Judiciary Committee, both in the degree in which he advocated certain sugges-

tions and his forbearance in advocating others. He agreed with the committee that it would be better not to go beyond the field of admission of immigrants for permanent residence into the United States, and to leave for later matters dealing with procedure, deportation, and naturalization. By his forbearance, he contributed greatly to the success of the committee in reporting the present bill.

Let me assure the Senator from Oregon that not only will I do all I can to schedule speedy hearings on the deportation bill at the next session of Congress, but that I have already notified the organizations interested in the judicial review bill that we are going to hold hearings speedily in the early part of the next session. I hope that the Senator from Oregon will be there as a witness at the hearings.

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator from North Carolina that I will be there as a witness. This is not the first time I have found the Senator from North Carolina to be persuasively convincing.

When I heard him a few moments ago, and when I heard the Senator from Massachusetts making the remarks he did as to the committee problem which faced the Senator from North Carolina, in handling this immigration bill, vis-a-vis the national origins problem, I would have to agree that what we should do from a parliamentary standpoint is to delimit the bill primarily to consideration of the problem of national origins.

I would have to agree with that. However, it does not mean that I do not believe the statute of limitations should not be remedied. It is an injustice, and should be remedied early.

I thank both the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from North Carolina. At least, we have pinpointed the problem, and we can go on with consideration of my bill, and the bill which I believe the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] is about to introduce.

The last comment I wish to make is by way of a deserved compliment to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL]. He, too, has been very much concerned over the general problem of injustice which we have been discussing in respect to the administration of the immigration laws of this country.

The proposal of the Senator from Rhode Island is one which I highly endorse. I assure him that I appreciate the support he has given me on my proposal in the past, and I intend to reciprocate by sincerely supporting his proposal when he offers it.

Mr. President, I should like to make certain that my bill has been received at the desk under the request I have previously made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). The Senator's bill will be held until Friday. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, first, I ask to be made a cosponsor of the bill introduced by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. I welcome the Senator's sponsorship.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from New York for their kind words.

First, upon the question of deportation and then one or two general comments on the bill before us. Last August I offered a bill cosponsored by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] which provided for the basic provisions in the bill as submitted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], but in addition to providing a 10-year statute of limitations on deportation proceedings, it also made two additional points.

First, it would put an end to the present practice whereby naturalized citizens who refuse to testify before congressional committees could have their citizenship revoked, which would again seem to indicate that naturalized citizens are a different kind of citizens from those born in the United States. To my mind, it seems unfair that citizens by choice rather than citizens by the accident of birth should be given the favored spot and not the unfavored spot.

Second, my bill would seek to rectify what has been already cleared up by the Supreme Court in the Schneider case. This was the case which decided that individuals born in a foreign country and naturalized in the United States, and then, through no fault of their own, spent more than 3 years' residence in the country of their birth, would lose their citizenship. This is on the statute books but declared by the Supreme Court to be unconstitutional. It should be repealed.

Thus, the third portion of my bill would provide for cleaning up the statute by removing those points which have already been rendered inoperative because of the Supreme Court's decision.

My hope is that at the same time the bill of the Senator from Oregon is considered by the Judiciary Committee, my bill, S. 2364, might also be considered, covering these other two points. I would ask the Senator in charge of the bill whether that will be agreeable to him. I thank both him and the Senator from North Carolina for their willingness to consider the basic problem of this question on deportation, and I am wondering whether these other points in my bill might be considered at that time.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The points which the Senator from Rhode Island has raised are worthy of consideration. The bill of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has been introduced and will be appropriately referred. It would probably be up to the members of the committee to make the determination whether the bills will be considered together or whether there is overlapping of the legislation. But certainly, as a member of the committee, I would hope that there would be expeditious hearings.

In view of the fact that the Senator from North Carolina has indicated his interest in this whole general area, I would hope the subcommittee itself would consider the points which have been raised and we will have recommendations from the Attorney General in this area, as he has indicated in his letter.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. As I indicated earlier,

I would not want to press this as an amendment. I had it redrafted as an amendment to the present bill but, realizing the importance of having support for the bill, behind which we all seem to be pretty well grouped, I would not want to jeopardize its passage by offering this measure as an amendment. But I hope my bill will be considered by the Judiciary Committee early in the next session.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I will say to my good friend from Rhode Island that I share the opinion of the Senator from Massachusetts that the proposal of the Senator from Rhode Island merits serious study. A very good case could be made for the doctrine that a naturalized citizen should stand on the same footing as a native-born citizen.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator, and appreciate his courtesy, as a senior member of the committee, and that of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to make some general comments on the bill.

Mr. President, the bill before us presents Congress with the opportunity to adopt an equitable and enlightened immigration policy—a clear departure from the discriminatory national origins policy that is our present law. It presents us with the opportunity to prove to the rest of the world that the faith of our Founding Fathers has not been lost. And it grants a greater measure of hope to those in other lands who have long held the dream of becoming active participants in the oldest, active democracy the world knows.

The passage of this reform bill getting rid of quotas based on national origins gives me particular delight since my father, then a Member of Congress, opposed the basic restrictive nationalities immigration law when it came up some 45 years ago.

Contrary to the opinions of some of the misinformed, this legislation does not open the floodgates. It increase our total quota of immigrants from approximately 158,000 to 170,000 per year. It still prefers those who have needed skills and who can contribute in a positive fashion to this Nation's progress. It contains that long-lacking element of humaneness which allows the reuniting of families. And it does away with the discrimination of a national origins system which states, in effect as well as in practice, that Southern and Eastern Europeans do not make as good citizens as Western and Northern Europeans—the Orwellian "All animals are equal, but some are more equal than others."

When we go back to the question of why this original concept was put into effect, we realize how correct we are in urging the adoption of the present legislation before us.

In 3 years, the question "Where were you born?" as a condition of entrance, will become academic, and this country will look instead to the relationship to U.S. citizens and resident aliens, to the professional and other high skills which are offered, and to the assistance of refugees from strife-torn lands.

This bill represents the progressive thinking of a country which has assumed

23594

the leadership of the free world. It is really a statement of faith that we mean to continue that leadership, and all the responsibilities and obligations which it entails.

I intend to vote for this bill because I have seen firsthand, through my work as a Vice Consul in our Foreign Service and on the International Rescue Committee, the difficulties and untold hardships which confront refugees and those who wish to emigrate to the United States. Since my election as U.S. Senator from Rhode Island, I have received hundreds of pleas for assistance in getting a brother, a daughter, a mother into this country.

The enactment of H.R. 2580 will eliminate, in great part, most of the hardships written into existing law. I urge my colleagues to join in its passage.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Oregon be added as a cosponsor of my bill (S. 2364).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89-187, the Speaker had appointed Mr. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, Mr. GRAY, of Illinois, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, and Mr. HUTCHINSON, of Michigan as members of the Father Marquette Tercentenary Commission on the part of the House.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 13, 89th Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. CORMAN, of California, as a member of the Select Committee To Conduct Studies and Investigations of the Problems of Small Business, to fill an existing vacancy thereon.

The message announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9811) to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOLEY, Mr. POAGE, Mr. ABBITT, Mr. HAGEN of California, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. PURCELL, Mr. DAGUE, Mr. BELCHER, and Mr. TEAGUE of California were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

HOW THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY ABETS THE COMMUNISTS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President last week the John Birch Society opened a headquarters in Washington, thus adding to a local menagerie of extremists which already includes the American Nazi Party and—on a visiting basis for demonstration purposes—a substantial portion of the beatnik population of the Nation.

While we have a commission to protect the architectural beauty of the district so that the Capital City will always be a place of enduring loveliness for the American people, there is no way in which we can protect the city from the political ugliness of our rightwing and leftwing extremists. We must tolerate them, as much as it affronts our sense of decency, because the Constitution must be kept inviolate.

As my colleagues know, I have been a consistent critic of the John Birch Society.

By its extremist antics—its wild charges of communism leveled against everyone with whom it disagrees, from President Eisenhower down; its campaign to impeach Chief Justice Warren; its thesis that the Communists have virtually taken control of the U.S. Government; its conspiratorial activities at community level—by these and many other irresponsible activities, the Birch Society has gravely complicated the task of responsible anti-Communists.

Indeed, the John Birch Society has been a real windfall to the Communist conspiracy because it provides them with a convenient caricature of anticommunism which they skillfully exploit to encourage the spread of anti-anti-communism.

While I know it is in bad taste to speak about one's own honors, I have recently received an accolade from the John Birch Society which I cannot resist mentioning to my colleagues.

In their August bulletin I was assailed as—and I quote their words directly—"by far the most persistent, continuous, aggressive—and damaging—enemy the society has had in the U.S. Senate."

I am profoundly flattered by this designation, and I promise to do my best to merit it.

Let me take the time to read to Senators a few of the pertinent paragraphs from the recent bulletin of the John Birch Society, for the purpose of illustrating the berserk quality of the society's anticommunism, and its sweeping rejection of all those, no matter how anti-Communist, who do not share the society's lunatic beliefs:

Nor has the American public had much opportunity to see behind the smooth and brilliant facade of Senator Dodd. Our own chief interest in him should come, perhaps, from the fact that he actually boasts of having himself physically participated in the civil rights mob march on Washington, led by Bayard Rustin in August 1963. Or his other extreme support of the civil rights fraud. But it is worth noting that he practically began his career in 1935 by establishing the Connecticut division of the National Youth Administration, with all of its leftwing impact and affiliation. Also, that later he was chief trial counsel at the infamous Nuremberg trials, correctly described by Senator Taft as a blot forever on the honor of the United States. And perhaps more significant than any of these things is the fact that he is such a close friend and protégé of Dean Acheson. In fact Acheson's name headed the list of members of the National Nonpartisan Committee for Dodd's reelection to the Senate in 1964.

Among other members of this committee were Steve Allen, Adolph Berle, Victor Borge, Irving Brown, Leo Cherne, Sidney Hook, Brig. Gen. S. L. A. Marshall, Harry and Bo-

naro Overstreet, Elmo Roper, and Dean Eugene Rostow.

Now it so happens that several people on that list—Steve Allen, S. L. A. Marshall, and Harry Overstreet for instance—have for years been among the most vicious, outspoken, and mendacious enemies of the John Birch Society. It further so happens that Senator Dodd, although many of his attacks on us have been more subtle than those, let us say, of his good friend Harry Overstreet, has for years been by far the most persistent, continuous, aggressive—and damaging—enemy the society has had in the U.S. Senate. But we have been able to take bitter and repeated attacks on ourselves—as from William F. Buckley, Jr., for instance—without ever striking back, and in fact while continuing to give our full support to the anti-Socialist efforts of the attackers.

So let's make it plain that these comments are in no way prompted by Senator Dodd's insidious and not so insidious thrusts at the John Birch Society. But since the Senator now has nearly 6 years tenure ahead of him before another senatorial election, and since he is now becoming so much bolder in supporting the brazen movement ever farther to the left of this administration—of whose most inner circle he is an inner part—we reluctantly concluded that it was our duty to warn our members not to be misled by the vaunted and highly publicized anti-communism of THOMAS JOSEPH DODD. For—as our excellent research department advised us fully 5 years ago—it is as shallow and opportunistic as the anticommunism of HUBERT HUMPHREY or Henry Cabot Lodge, and a misunderstanding on this point can mislead with regard to many others.

Thus spoke the bulletin of the John Birch Society.

Coming from a man of Robert Welch's genius for fantasy and obfuscation, these paragraphs are not at all surprising.

After all, this is the man who has described President Eisenhower and his brother Milton Eisenhower as members of the Red network:

In my opinion—

He said—

the chances are very strong that Milton Eisenhower is actually Dwight Eisenhower's superior and boss within the whole leftwing establishment.

This is also the man who said of John Foster Dulles:

For many reasons, and after a lot of study, I personally believe Dulles to be a Communist agent who has one clearly defined role to play; namely, always to say the right things and always to do the wrong ones.

And this is the man who said of Gen. Lucius Clay that it was his function "to mess up the Berlin situation so favorably for the Russians."

According to Mr. Welch's peculiar brand of lunacy, any form of social progress, whether it is civil rights or unemployment insurance or medicare, is equated with communism. Thus, in the running scoreboard he keeps of the degree of control exercised by the Communists in various countries, Mr. Welch says that in the United States the Communists have a 60-80 percent control. Great Britain, Italy, and Norway are supposed to be 50-70 percent controlled by the Communists, while India was 60-80 percent and Iceland 80-100 percent.

Mr. Welch has an elixir, compounded of a few fundamentalist ingredients, for

September 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23595

solving all of our problems. All we have to do is abolish the income tax; impeach Earl Warren; reestablish States rights; get the United States out of the United Nations and the United Nations out of the United States; "put an end to the Alliance for Progress and foreign aid, and abolish Radio Free Europe, the Voice of America, the U.S. Information Service, the Peace Corps, and all similar absurdities."

What is distressing is that despite the patent lunacy of his charges and his program, Robert Welch has been able to attract the support of many thousands of people who are groping for answers about communism and who might have followed other leadership if it had established contact with them first.

Although it is proper to hope that the majority of those who today follow Robert Welch will some day come to understand the folly and danger of the course he has charted for their organization, the membership cannot altogether be exonerated.

Mr. William Buckley, the editor of *National Review*, in a recent series of articles assailing the John Birch Society from the standpoint of responsible conservatism, had this to say on the subject of the responsibility of the membership:

One continues to wonder how it is that the membership of the John Birch Society tolerates such drivel. Until the members rise up and demand leadership whose programs and analyses are based on other than the premise that practically every liberal politician, every confused professor, every civil rights demonstrator, everyone who wants free medicine and civil rights legislation, and Government control of the economy, is an agent of the Communist conspiracy—until then, at least, they ought not to go about the country complaining that the society is misrepresented. Their voices are undoubtedly misrepresented. But their own voices are not the voices of the John Birch Society.

The John Birch Society is not listed as a subversive organization by the Attorney General, and, in the legal sense of the term, it was specifically found not to be a subversive organization by the California Subcommittee on Un-American Activities which looked into the activities of the Birch Society in 1963. The California subcommittee, however, noted the striking similarity between the organization and techniques of the Communist Party and the John Birch Society.

Each has a monolithic structure—

Said the report—

in which authority gravitates from the top down through the various echelons to the rank and file membership. Each employs front organizations which it controls from behind the scenes * * *. Each operates bookstores and reading rooms through which it spreads its ideology * * *. Each movement operates through small units scattered throughout the country. The Communists call them clubs, the Birchers call them chapters. Each publishes a monthly list of directives that establish the current line of activity. The Communists call theirs political affairs. The Birchers call theirs the John Birch Society bulletin. Each is geared to unleash a barrage of invective and attack against the other, and to bring to bear every pressure and device available.

An exceedingly interesting note on how the John Birch Society and other ex-

tremist groups have been operating in the Midwest appeared in a recent column by Mr. Charles Bartlett.

Said Mr. Bartlett:

Rural communities are occasionally riled by strange invasions. Four families came to Pinedale from California 3 years ago. They had bank accounts of about the same size; their children cheered the assassination of President Kennedy; they preached hatred against all minority groups; and they argued that Jesus Christ was an Anglo-Saxon instead of a Jew. Some local conservatives were attracted by their zeal but a storm of resentment broke around them last winter and they moved away.

I came back to the point I made in my opening remarks—that the extremist antics of the John Birch Society serve the purpose of the Communist conspiracy. They do so not merely because they provide the Communists with a convenient caricature, but also because the organization sows hatred and division and suspicion among our people.

Despite the anti-Communist intentions of these who have joined the society, the society, in terms of its objective impact, must be put down as an unwitting abettor of the Communist conspiracy.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to voice today my support of the immigration bill, H.R. 2580.

The central principle of this bill—the repeal of the national origins system—was first incorporated in a bill drafted in the Department of Justice while I was Attorney General. The bill distills the accumulated experience and wisdom of 40 years—the years since the institution of the discriminatory national origins system. That system was imposed during the postwar crisis in Europe, when many in the United States feared that a continuance of unlimited immigration would lead to the coming here of tens of millions of unlettered, poverty-stricken refugees—and of hundreds of thousands of revolutionaries.

Those fears proved unfounded. And ever since 1924, we have regretted the excesses of that day. Presidents of both parties—including every President for the last quarter century—have deplored the presence in American law of discriminations directly opposed to the assumptions of our Constitution. Both political parties, for many years, have called for the repeal of this system.

All have seen how absurd the system is. Thaddeus Kosciuszko and Casimir Pulaski built liberty for all Americans—and America says to their descendants, "You are less desirable than Englishmen or Irishmen." Arturo Toscanini built a symphonic and operatic tradition on these shores, and Enrico Fermi built weapons to save our sons' lives—and America says to their countrymen, "You are less welcome here than Swedes or Germans." But we know, all America

knows, that our immigrants have built this Nation—the last as well as the first.

And the follies and the random cruelties the national origins system imposes have become too clear to be ignored.

Last year, I urged passage of this immigration bill before the Subcommittee on Immigration of the House of Representatives. I told them about a widely known Turkish physician and scientist who sought to come to this country to pursue important research in treatment of heart attacks. An American medical school was anxious for his services; he was anxious to come. But because our immigration law considers Turks as less worthy than Englishmen, or Irishmen, or Germans, this doctors could not come. The United States had then been waiting a year and a half for the valuable services of this man. We waited until this summer—a total of 2½ years.

I spoke then of others equally qualified, equally likely to make major contributions to the welfare and culture of this country—a Korean radiation specialist; a Japanese microbiologist; a Greek chemist. We are still waiting for them.

Last year I noted that a maid, or an unskilled laborer from a northern European country can enter this country within a matter of weeks, while scientists or doctors or other highly skilled persons from less-favored countries wait for months and years.

Since I spoke then, about 5,000 more housemaids and unskilled laborers from northern Europe have come here. And the doctors and chemists and biologists are still waiting.

And others are waiting as well—American citizens, waiting for their parents and brothers and children. An American citizen whose mother is Greek must wait more than 5 years before she can get a visa. An American citizen whose brother, or sister, or married son or daughter is Italian or Australian, Spanish or Portuguese, Japanese or Korean, Indian or Filipino, cannot expect a visa for them until Congress passes a special bill. The last such bill, passed in 1962, admitted all such relatives who had first applied more than 8 years earlier.

A system which allows an American citizen to bring to this country a maid or a gardener overnight—but forces him to wait 8 years for his sister—makes no sense at all.

It makes even less sense when we realize that every year, tens of thousands of authorized quota visas go unused—because the principal beneficiaries of our discriminatory system neither want nor need the numbers allotted to them.

England and Ireland are assigned 83,000 numbers—over half our total—but only 32,000 come from these countries each year. The other 51,000 numbers are lost.

All this the bill will change. It will eliminate from the statute books a form of discrimination totally alien to the spirit of the Constitution. Distinctions based on race or national origin assume what our law, our traditions, and our commonsense deny: that the worth of men can be judged on a group basis.

23596

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 20, 1965

Our ancient struggle for due process of law, for equal protection and individual rights, is the story of the struggle for individual treatment—for the proposition that no disability may be imposed on men as members of a class.

Such distinctions will now be abolished. The children of Pulaski will have the same chance to come to these shores as the children of Lafayette; the descendants of Verrazanno and Columbus will have a fair chance to see the shores that their ancestors first explored. They will compete for admission to this country on the basis of their family ties here, and on their potential contribution to the welfare and culture of the United States. No longer will the place of a man's birth determine whether he has a place in America.

There is one provision of this bill, however, that is in my judgment a serious mistake. The bill would put a ceiling on immigration from the Western Hemisphere, roughly equivalent to the present rate.

Three years from now, the question of immigration from the Western Hemisphere would be reexamined.

This provision would impose a statutory limit on immigration from Latin America and Canada for the first time in our history. Even in 1920 and 1924, when the national origins system sharply limited immigration from the rest of the world, the Congress recognized the special relationship between the United States and our neighbors to the north and south, and refused to place a flat numerical limitation on immigration from the Western Hemisphere. This provision ignores that history, and that special relationship. In a world which is searching for increased cooperation and closeness between nations, the relationship of the United States with Canada and Latin America could serve as a goal and a model for others. We should not go backward now.

Placing a statutory limit on immigration in the Western Hemisphere, is, moreover, without any affirmative benefit.

The strict requirements of our law with regard to literacy, health, and ability to support oneself without displacing American workers, insure that no more immigrants will come here from the Western Hemisphere than can be reasonably absorbed.

Congress did not at that time regard this far greater volume of immigration as anything but a benefit to the United States.

Now, with a population twice as great, and a gross national product more than seven times as great, we are saying by this provision that we are fearful of immigration from the Western Hemisphere.

Our relationship with Canada and Latin America is unique in the world. In our relationship with Latin America in particular, we are engaged in a great experiment to see whether the societies which are rich and free can help those who are less free and poor, and to live in a world society in peace and harmony.

It is not in our interest to turn away from this experiment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield. Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. It is my understanding that in 1924 we had an immigration from Western Hemisphere countries of 190,000 immigrants. As the Senator pointed out, assuming the fact we had 190,000 coming at that particular time, there was no effort to place a restriction on the Western Hemisphere countries.

I believe that in light of the history of our relationship with the Western Hemisphere countries, it is important to indicate to our Latin American and Canadian friends that there are many of us deeply concerned about this particular provision in the legislation.

I wanted to ask the Senator whether it was his feeling given the history of our relationships within the Western Hemisphere, that the provisions of this bill are of a restrictive nature?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Let me say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I do. The 1924 population was only 100 million, about 190,000 immigrants came from Latin American countries; and the gross national product of the United States was only \$86 billion. Today the population of the United States is 190 million, and the gross national product is more than \$600 billion.

Certainly, if we could afford no limitation at that time, it would seem unreasonable to propose a limitation at this time. We have a special relationship with the countries of Latin America.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. As I understand, the bill as it passed the House provided for a moving or sliding formula; that is, if hemispheric immigration exceeded by more than 10 percent the mean of the previous 5 years, it would be the responsibility of the President to report to Congress with recommendations, if any. Does the Senator from New York feel that this kind of provision along with the other provisions in the proposed legislation, such as the tightening of the labor restrictions and the health and the public charge provisions, would have served us well in seeing that there would not be a wave of individuals who would come to the United States from the Western Hemisphere countries?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is correct. Therefore immigration from the Western Hemisphere is, I believe, a gratuitous issue at this time. And this is particularly true when we consider our relationship with Latin America and Canada, which is so close.

It is an example to other countries all over the world where people have trouble getting along with their neighbors.

All we have to do is look around at Vietnam, South Vietnam, Cambodia, Pakistan, and India, the problems in the Middle East and Arab countries, and even Jordan and Egypt.

Here we have this close relationship that exists between our 21 nations to the south—20 close, intimate friends of ours—and Canada to the north. I believe it should be continued.

I do not think this aids to it and I am opposed to it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. As

a final point, I believe there have been many who suggested if we had not adopted the ceiling of 120,000 we would be opening the floodgates, so to speak, to the tremendous population growth and development in Central America and South America.

But I hasten to add, as the Senator from New York pointed out, in our colloquy, that this bill still provides strong safeguards with regard to the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, so far as the health provisions, the public charge provisions, and so forth. Therefore, we are making a generalization that without this kind of firm ceiling we would be opening up our floodgates. It is unrealistic.

Does the Senator agree?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree. Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point the separate views filed by myself and Senators HART and JAVITS on this matter.

There being no objection, the separate views were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPARATE VIEWS OF MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS, MR. HART, AND MR. JAVITS

The 1965 amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act, as reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee, contain a numerical ceiling of 120,000 quota numbers for the Western Hemisphere, effective July 1, 1968. This restriction was placed in the bill, over our opposition, during the Senate Immigration Subcommittee's consideration of H.R. 2580. The amendment to the bill also calls for the establishment of a Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration to study and report to the Congress on the demographic, economic, and social trends in this hemisphere and their implications for U.S. immigration policy.

At no other time in the history of our immigration policy have we disturbed or altered the unique relationship that exists among the nations of the New World. The direction of the many treaties and formal agreements between the nations of this hemisphere has been one of bringing greater unity among friends—not the imposition of restrictions. Even with enactment of our most restrictive general immigration law in 1924, special recognition was given to Western Hemisphere countries, at a time when total immigration from the hemisphere to the United States was almost double our present average experience. Yet today, in an unprecedented period of U.S. power and affluence, we are faced with the possibility of placing a quota for the first time on immigration from this hemisphere.

The existence of a nonquota status for nationals of the Western Hemisphere has never been considered a form of discrimination against the other nations of the world, for the distinction was not based on race, religion, or ethnic origin. It was a firm indication of our esteem for our good neighbors and our pride in the special solidarity that exists among the people of this hemisphere. Now, despite the absence of any real immigration problem, and the presence of more stringent qualitative controls on entry to this country, it is proposed that we take this historic step backward in our otherwise progressive Western Hemisphere policies.

We consider this decision by the Senate Immigration Subcommittee to be most regrettable. The majority of the hemisphere immigrants come to us from our closest neighbors—Canada and Mexico. We have long welcomed especially the contributions of these nations to our culture and society.

It is our hope, should this provision remain in the bill, that the Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration, having time to give proper consideration to this issue, will see the benefits that would result from a continuation of our present immigration policy within the Americas and recommend the elimination of the quota limitation in this bill prior to its effective date.

EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
PHILIP A. HART,
JACOB K. JAVITS.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, would the Senator yield so that I may make some observations, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. ERVIN. The colloquy between the Senator from New York and the Senator from Massachusetts regarding a Western Hemisphere ceiling reminds me that on February 25, 1955, the then Senator Lehman of New York, on behalf of himself, Senator Green from Rhode Island, Senator HUMPHREY from Minnesota, Senator Kefauver from Tennessee, the late President Kennedy, while he was serving as a Member of this body, Senator Langer of North Dakota, Senator Chavez of New Mexico, Senator MAGNUSON of Washington, Senator McNAMARA of Michigan, Senator MORSE of Oregon, Senator Murray of Montana, Senator PASTORE of Rhode Island, and the late Senator Richard Neuberger of Oregon, introduced a bill to replace the so-called McCarran-Walter Act.

In stating the principal purposes of this bill, Senator Lehman said that the bill was to establish an annual world immigration ceiling of approximately 250,000 a year. Then, he stated that one of the major purposes would be to require all ordinary immigration from the Western Hemisphere to be included within the annual quota limits.

In other words, the bill which was introduced by Senator Lehman and his cosponsors on February 25, 1955, established a worldwide immigration quota of 250,000 persons and covered the Western Hemisphere along with the Eastern Hemisphere.

On February 25, 1955, the same day, Senator Lehman, in a speech in the Senate, said:

A major feature of the proposed act is its consolidation, within the quota, of all general immigration, including immigration from the Western Hemisphere. This has been done in order to put all foreign countries on the same basis consistent with the best interest and needs of the United States. Thus the proposed act does not give non-quota status, as present law does, to aliens born in the Western Hemisphere, with the right to immigrate to the United States without limitation as to number.

Senator Lehman then testified in favor of the bill before the Committee on the Judiciary on November 22, 1955. In the course of his testimony, he said:

I say to those who criticize placing Western Hemisphere nations under the quota system—let's be fair to all. The same criteria should apply to all peoples, regardless of the place of their birth. I believe our Latin American neighbors will respect us for such a policy.

Two years prior to that time, on August 3, 1953, Senator Lehman, who was

the first person to introduced a bill to abolish the national origins quota system of the McCarran-Walter Act, said this on the same subject:

In the place of the national origins quota system a new unified quota system has been substituted. This new system, for the first time, places all general immigration for permanent residence, including immigration from the Western Hemisphere, within the framework of the liberalized quota system, and makes that system equitable and non-discriminatory in all respects while at the same time maintaining a regulated and closely supervised flow of immigration to these shores.

I cite these statements because I believe they have a direct bearing on the subject the Senator from New York is discussing. I recognize that there is a difference of opinion on this point. Some take the position that it would be wiser not to impose a limitation on immigration from the Western Hemisphere; others take Senator Lehman's position. This is my position for two reasons: In the first place, such a limitation would abolish discrimination in favor of the Western Hemisphere as against the Eastern Hemisphere; and, in the second place, it would be wiser at this time to impose a limitation, because, at a future date, when we receive pressure for immigration from those countries, it will be more difficult to impose restrictions.

I think all of us agree that we do not want unrestricted immigration; that the country is no longer in a position to accept unrestricted immigration. I feel we should be consistent in applying our restrictions.

As the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] said a moment ago, the bill contains a safeguard in that it postpones the effective date of the limitation on immigration from the Western Hemisphere until July 1, 1968, and establishes a commission to study this problem, in the meantime.

I thank the Senator from New York for yielding and giving me the opportunity to call attention to the statements made by the late Senator Lehman in 1953 and 1955.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from North Carolina. I appreciate also the force of his argument and the position that was taken a decade ago by Senator Lehman and others, including, as I believe the Senator from North Carolina mentioned, Senator Kennedy of Massachusetts.

Mr. ERVIN. Yes. The late Senator from New York, Mr. Lehman, advocated, in prior sessions of Congress, many of the features of the bill now before the Senate. It is rather significant that this bill should be the culmination of the many recommendations made by the late Senator from New York, and also that they should have been approved and advocated by the late former Senator John F. Kennedy, brother of the distinguished junior Senator from New York, who himself has had much to do with bringing this legislation to fruition, and whose brother, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who is managing the bill so well.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank

the Senator from North Carolina. But I repeat my belief that our relationship with Canada and Latin America is unique in the world. Our relationship with Latin America, in particular, is of special importance at this time. We are engaged in a great experiment, to see whether societies which are rich and free can help those which are less free and poor, in a feeling of partnership, to live in a world society in peace and harmony. I believe it is not in our interest to turn away from this experiment at the present time; I think we would be in error in doing so.

The hardships and the inequities that will be righted by this bill can be seen from the files of any Senator.

Mrs. Berta Alfassa is an elderly widow, whose one sister is an American citizen. She would like to spend her last years with her sister and brother-in-law here in New York State; but the Greek fourth-preference quota is filled for longer than Mrs. Alfassa can expect to live. When this bill is passed, she will be able to come to this country within 2 years time.

Salvatore and Terresa Alanzone and their three daughters want to join their family here. Because the Italian fourth-preference quota does not exist, they have been waiting since September of 1954. Mr. Alanzone is 61 and his wife is 55; under the present system, no visa would be available for them for an indefinite time. But under the bill we are now passing, the Alanzones will join their loved ones here before the year is out.

Wong Chik Chi has been waiting to join her daughter, Yuet Woo Hom, a citizen of the United States. Under present law, it is difficult to tell how much longer their mother and daughter will have to wait to be reunited, but under the new bill, which gives nonquota status to parents of American citizens, they would be reunited as fast as papers could be processed.

Mrs. Ruth Alony was born in Israel. She came here as a student, and last year married a native Israeli now resident in the United States awaiting his citizenship. Because the Israeli quota is so small, she cannot remain here. She and her husband are faced with a cruel choice; either she must return to Israel and leave him here to await his citizenship, or her visa; or he must return to Israel with her and forfeit his chance for citizenship. But the bill we are now enacting into law would give her a visa almost immediately.

But to my mind most important, we need immigration. The history of America, as Oscar Handlin has said, is the history of immigrants.

Our strength is in variety, not sameness. Our unity is that of the living, not the graveyard. Our greatness we owe not to the bayonet, or to the atomic bomb, but to our capacity to attract and absorb the richness of diversity—because to all men we attempt to secure the same measure of freedom and opportunity.

Yet our immigration policy has lagged behind the promises of our tradition and the progress of the world. Trade crosses borders ever more freely;

capital flows by the mere entering of figures on ledgers; ideas spirit from one country to another as fast as the printing press and the airplane can carry them; news, protests, approvals, anger and gratitude travel with the speed of light. But people—the people who make the goods, create the capital, think and live the ideas—move almost as slowly as if the airplane or even the railroad had never been invented.

Robert Young, in his campaign for railroad reform, used to say:

A hog can go coast to coast without changing trains—but you can't.

And so it is now; Olivetti typewriters and Fellini movies come here more smoothly and easily than the gifted people who make them.

This is the central problem of immigration today; that the law has not kept pace with the development of this Nation and of the world. It has not recognized that one people is not intrinsically superior or inferior to another people. It has not recognized that individuals have rights irrespective of their citizenship. It has not recognized that the relevant community is not merely the nation but all men of good will. It has not recognized that no human institution can cease to change and grow—without dying.

It is time that the law catch up to the world. And it is time that we help it to do so.

This legislation would accomplish this end. I am therefore pleased to have played a part in its creation. I am proud to work for it now. I think we will all be proud of its passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest that a page ask the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] to step into the Chamber.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, with the permission of the senior Senator from Oregon, I should like to commend the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, first, I commend the junior Senator from New York for his speech. I join him in commending the committee for their report on this bill.

Some of us have worked many years for this particular hour in trying to bring about the passage of a bill that would bring to an end what is considered to be gross discrimination and injustice in regard to the national origins aspect of our immigration policy.

I commend both the Senator from New York and the Senator from Massachusetts.

The Senator from Mississippi is present in the Chamber. I wish to state that shortly he and I propose to give a brief legislative history of the Defense appropriations bill.

The Senator from Mississippi has another engagement and must leave at an early hour. However, I am sure that he can stay long enough for the chairman of the subcommittee to make such comment as he cares to make.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Presiding Officer is under the impression that the Senator from New York has yielded the floor and the Chair then recognized the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator did not yield the floor, I apologize and yield the floor back to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I only have a few more moments.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from New York for his presentation here this afternoon and state that we were fortunate in the early part of the hearings to have the testimony of the Senator from New York on S. 500, which was the original Senate bill this year and which led to the bill that the Senate is considering today.

Senate bill 500 was introduced in this body by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]. This bill was the result of the constant work and deliberation of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Justice Department under the then Attorney General Kennedy.

I know that it was the basis of many of the ideas which are included in H.R. 2580. Many of those ideas have been worked over, developed and considered over a considerable period of time. The members of the committee appreciated the testimony that was given by the Senator from New York and appreciated the work of the Justice Department in placing before us the raw piece of marble that has now become H.R. 2580. Much of this groundwork was done when the junior Senator from New York was Attorney General.

I believe that this is a matter of record and should be noted by the Senate.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina was kind enough to mention my involvement in this matter several years ago and also the work done by the junior Senator from Massachusetts, my younger brother, who is the Senator in charge of the bill at the present time.

I should like to mention also that President Kennedy was interested in this matter before either of us, when he was in the House of Representatives, when he was a Senator, and finally when he became the President of the United States in 1961.

President Kennedy wrote a book entitled, "A Nation of Immigrants." The work on that book was not completed in November 1963. The work on that book continued after November of 1963 under my general supervision, together with Mr. Mike Feldman at the White House. We contributed ideas to the book, as did my brother, the junior Senator from Massachusetts.

The book traces the immigration progress here in the United States and also the role that President Kennedy played in that progress and how he felt about the matter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this book, which is relatively small, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the book was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A NATION OF IMMIGRANTS

(By John F. Kennedy)

INTRODUCTION BY ROBERT F. KENNEDY

I know of no cause which President Kennedy championed more warmly than the improvement of our immigration policies. Our attitude toward the immigrant has gradually matured to a full appreciation of the contribution he can make and has made to American life. Much of the story of that development is set forth in this book. But recent years have witnessed a legislative lag.

Every forward step in immigration legislation since World War II bore the John F. Kennedy imprint: the Displaced Persons Act and the Refugee Relief Act, which he sponsored while in Congress; the 1957 bill to bring families together, which he led to passage in the Senate; and the comprehensive reform of our law which he recommended to Congress as President.

In 1958, while the fight for the 1957 amendments was still fresh, he published his first edition of this book. It was deliberately designed to provide those who were unfamiliar with this aspect of our history with an appreciation of the enormous contributions to American life made by immigrants. He felt that this understanding was essential to any future effort to eliminate the discrimination and cruelty of our immigration laws.

When President Kennedy sent his historic message to Congress calling for a complete revision of the law, he decided it was also time to revise the book for use as a weapon of enlightenment in the coming legislative battle.

He was working on the book at the time of the assassination. It was decided that it should be published posthumously. This legacy should not be denied those committed to the battle for immigration reform.

President Kennedy's interest in the immigrant and in the law governing his admission to the United States sprang from many sources. He was himself only two generations removed from an immigrant. On his sentimental visit to Ireland in June of 1963, he stood at the spot from which Patrick Kennedy embarked, and said:

"When my great-grandfather left here to become a cooper in East Boston, he carried nothing with him except a strong religious faith and a strong desire for liberty. If he hadn't left, I would be working at the Albacross Co. across the road."

For 14 years, in the House and in the Senate, he represented Massachusetts, which has the highest percentage of foreign nationality groups of any State in our country. President Kennedy met with them, in their homes and factories, at their picnics and cultural events. He admired their heritage and their determination to succeed. A student of history, President Kennedy understood the fruitful interplay between the immigrants and the Nation they adopted. They must be given full credit for changing America from a colony to a leader of the free world, from a predominantly agricultural economy to a highly diversified, highly skilled industrial complex.

Our attitude toward immigration reflects our faith in the American ideal. We have always believed it possible for men and women who start at the bottom to rise as far as their talent and energy allow. Neither race nor creed nor place of birth should affect their chances.

As I stated before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality in July 1964, it is my conviction that

September 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23599

there are few areas in our law which more urgently demand than our present unfair system of choosing the immigrants we will allow to enter the United States. It is a source of embarrassment to us around the world. It is a source of anguish to many of our own citizens with relatives abroad. It is a source of loss to the economic and creative strength of our Nation as a whole.

There is no reason to believe that anything has happened to change the relation between America and its immigrants. The number of people who wish to come here today is much smaller than it was in the 19th century. But their aspirations are the same. Their need is as great. The contribution they can make is, if anything, even greater.

In this book, President Kennedy tells us what immigrants have done for America, and what America has done for its immigrants. It is one of the dramatic success stories of world history. I am very happy that this book is being reissued now, so it can stand as a testament to a cause President Kennedy cherished, and which we should carry on.

CHAPTER 1—A NATION OF NATIONS

On May 11, 1831, Alexis de Tocqueville, a young French aristocrat, disembarked in the bustling harbor of New York City. He had crossed the ocean to try to understand the implications for European civilization of the new experiment in democracy on the far side of the Atlantic. In the next 9 months, Tocqueville and his friend Gustave de Beaumont traveled the length and breadth of the eastern half of the continent—from Boston to Green Bay and from New Orleans to Quebec—in search of the essence of American life.

Tocqueville was fascinated by what he saw. He marveled at the energy of the people who were building the new Nation. He admired many of the new political institutions and ideals. And he was impressed most of all by the spirit of equality that pervaded the life and customs of the people. Though he had reservations about some of the expressions of this spirit, he could discern its workings in every aspect of American society—in politics, business, personal relations, culture, thought. This commitment to equality was in striking contrast to the class-ridden society of Europe. Yet Tocqueville believed "the democratic revolution" to be irresistible.

"Balanced between the past and the future," as he wrote of himself, "with no natural instinctive attraction toward either, I could without effort quietly contemplate each side of the question." On his return to France, Tocqueville delivered his dispassionate and penetrating judgment of the American experiment in his great work "Democracy in America." No one, before or since, has written about the United States with such insight. And, in discussing the successive waves of immigration from England, France, Spain, and other European countries, Tocqueville identified a central factor in the American democratic faith:

"All these European colonies contained the elements, if not the development, of a complete democracy. Two causes led to this result. It may be said that on leaving the mother country the emigrants had, in general, no notion of superiority one over another. The happy and powerful do not go into exile, and there are no surer guarantees of equality among men than poverty and misfortune."

To show the power of the equalitarian spirit in America, Tocqueville added: "It happened, however, on several occasions, that persons of rank were driven to America by political and religious quarrels. Laws were made to establish a gradation of ranks; but it was soon found that the soil of America was opposed to a territorial aristocracy."

What Alexis de Tocqueville saw in America was a society of immigrants, each of whom had begun life anew, on an equal footing. This was the secret of America: a nation of people with the fresh memory of old traditions who dared to explore new frontiers, people eager to build lives for themselves in a spacious society that did not restrict their freedom of choice and action.

Since 1607, when the first English settlers reached the New World, over 42 million people have migrated to the United States. This represents the largest migration of people in all recorded history. It is two and a half times the total number of people now living in Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Idaho, Kansas, Maine, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, and Wyoming.

Another way of indicating the importance of immigration to America is to point out that every American who ever lived, with the exception of one group, was either an immigrant himself or a descendant of immigrants.

The exception? Will Rogers, part Cherokee Indian, said that his ancestors were at the dock to meet the *Mayflower*. And some anthropologists believe that the Indians themselves were immigrants from another continent who displaced the original Americans—the aborigines.

In just over 350 years, a nation of nearly 200 million people has grown up, populated almost entirely by persons who either came from other lands or whose forefathers came from other lands. As President Franklin D. Roosevelt reminded a convention of the Daughters of the American Revolution, "Remember, remember always, that all of us, and you and I especially, are descended from immigrants and revolutionists."

Any great social movement leaves its mark, and the massive migration of peoples to the New World was no exception to this rule. The interaction of disparate cultures, the vehemence of the ideals that led the immigrants here, the opportunity offered by a new life, all gave America a flavor and a character that make it as unmistakable and as remarkable to people today as it was to Alexis de Tocqueville in the early part of the 19th century. The contribution of immigrants can be seen in every aspect of our national life. We see it in religion, in politics, in business, in the arts, in education, even in athletics and in entertainment. There is no part of our Nation that has not been touched by our immigrant background. Everywhere immigrants have enriched and strengthened the fabric of American life. As Walt Whitman said:

These States are the amplest poem,
Here is not merely a nation but a
teeming Nation of nations.

To know America, then, it is necessary to understand this peculiarly American social revolution. It is necessary to know why over 42 million people gave up their settled lives to start anew in a strange land. We must know how they met the new land and how it met them, and, most important, we must know what these things mean for our present and for our future.

CHAPTER 2—WHY THEY CAME

Little is more extraordinary than the decision to migrate, little more extraordinary than the accumulation of emotions and thoughts which finally leads a family to say farewell to a community where it has lived for centuries, to abandon old ties and familiar landmarks, and to sail across dark seas to a strange land. Today, when mass communications tell one part of the world all about another, it is relatively easy to understand how poverty or tyranny might compel people to exchange an old nation for a new

one. But centuries ago migration was a leap into the unknown. It was an enormous intellectual and emotional commitment. The forces that moved our forebears to their great decision—the decision to leave their homes and begin an adventure filled with incalculable uncertainty, risk and hardship—must have been of overpowering proportions.

Oscar Handlin, in his book "The Uprooted," describes the experience of the immigrants: "The crossing immediately subjected the emigrant to a succession of shattering shocks and decisively conditioned the life of every man that survived it. This was the initial contact with life as it was to be. For many peasants it was the first time away from home, away from the safety of the circumscribed little villages in which they had passed all their years. Now they would learn to have dealings with people essentially different from themselves. Now they would collide with unaccustomed problems, learn to understand alien ways and alien languages, manage to survive in a grossly foreign environment."

Initially, they had to save up money for passage. Then they had to say goodbye to cherished relatives and friends, whom they could expect never to see again. They started their journey by traveling from their villages to the ports of embarkation. Some walked; the luckier trundled their few possessions into carts which they sold before boarding ship. Some paused along the road to work in the fields in order to eat. Before they even reached the ports of embarkation, they were subject to illness, accidents, storm and snow, even to attacks by outlaws.

After arriving at the ports, they often had to wait days, weeks, sometimes months, while they bargained with captains or agents for passage. Meanwhile, they crowded into cheap lodgings near the quays, sleeping on straw in small, dark rooms, sometimes as many as 40 in a room 12 by 15 feet.

Until the middle of the 19th century the immigrants traveled in sailing vessels. The average trip from Liverpool to New York took 40 days; but any estimate of time was hazardous, for the ship was subject to winds, tides, primitive navigation, unskilled seamanship and the whim of the captain. A good size for the tiny craft of those days was 300 tons, and each one was crowded with anywhere from 400 to a thousand passengers.

For the immigrants, their shipboard world was the steerage, that confined space below deck, usually about 75 feet long and 25 feet wide. In many vessels no one over 5½ feet tall could stand upright. Here they lived their days and nights, receiving their daily ration of vinegar-flavored water and trying to eke out sustenance from whatever provisions they had brought along. When their food ran out, they were often at the mercy of extortionate captains.

They huddled in their hard, cramped bunks, freezing when the hatches were open, stifling when they were closed. The only light came from a dim, swaying lantern. Night and day were indistinguishable. But they were ever aware of the treacherous winds and waves, the scampering of rats and the splash of burials. Diseases—cholera, yellow fever, smallpox and dysentery—took their toll. One in ten failed to survive the crossing.

Eventually the journey came to an end. The travelers saw the coast of America with mixed feelings of relief, excitement, trepidation and anxiety. For now, uprooted from old patterns of life, they found themselves in Handlin's phrase, "in a prolonged state of crisis—crisis in the sense that they were, and remained, unsettled." They reached the new land exhausted by lack of rest, bad food, confinement and the strain of adjustment to new conditions. But they could not pause to recover their strength. They had no re-

serve of food or money; they had to keep moving until they found work. This meant new strains at a time when their capacity to cope with new problems had already been overburdened.

There were probably as many reasons for coming to America as there were people who came. It was a highly individual decision. Yet it can be said that three large forces—religious persecution, political oppression and economic hardship—provided the chief motives for the mass migrations to our shores. They were responding, in their own way, to the pledge of the Declaration of Independence: the promise of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

The search for freedom of worship has brought people to America from the days of the Pilgrims to modern times. In our own day, for example, anti-Semitic and anti-Christian persecution in Hitler's Germany and the Communist empire have driven people from their homes to seek refuge in America. Not all found what they sought immediately. The Puritans of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, who drove Roger Williams and Anne Hutchinson into the wilderness, showed as little tolerance for dissenting beliefs as the Anglicans of England had shown to them. Minority religious sects, from the Quakers and Shakers through the Catholics and Jews to the Mormons and Jehovah's Witnesses, have at various times suffered both discrimination and hostility in the United States.

But the very diversity of religious belief has made for religious toleration. In demanding freedom for itself, each sect had increasingly to permit freedom for others. The insistence of each successive wave of immigrants upon its right to practice its religion helped make freedom of worship a central part of the American creed. People who gambled their lives on the right to believe in their own God would not lightly surrender that right in a new society.

The second great force behind immigration has been political oppression. America has always been a refuge from tyranny. As a nation conceived in liberty, it has held out to the world the promise of respect for the rights of man. Every time a revolution has failed in Europe, every time a nation has succumbed to tyranny, men and women who love freedom have assembled their families and their belongings and set sail across the seas. Nor has this process come to an end in our own day. The Russian Revolution, the terrors of Hitler's Germany and Mussolini's Italy, the Communist suppression of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, and the cruel measures of the Castro regime in Cuba—all have brought new thousands seeking sanctuary in the United States.

The economic factor has been more complex than the religious and political factors. From the very beginning, some have come to America in search of riches, some in flight from poverty, and some because they were bought and sold and had no choice.

And the various reasons have been intertwined. Thus some early arrivals were lured to these shores by dreams of amassing great wealth, like the Spanish conquistadors in Mexico and Peru. These adventurers, expecting quick profits in gold, soon found that real wealth lay in such crops as tobacco and cotton. As they built up the plantation economy in States like Virginia and the Carolinas, they needed cheap labor. So they began to import indentured servants from England, men and women who agreed to labor a term of years in exchange for eventual freedom, and slaves from Africa.

The process of industrialization in America increased the demand for cheap labor, and chaotic economic conditions in Europe increased the supply. If some immigrants continued to believe that the streets of New York were paved with gold, more were driven by the hunger and hardship of their native

lands. The Irish potato famine of 1845 brought almost a million people to America in 5 years. American manufacturers advertised in European newspapers, offering to pay the passage of any man willing to come to America to work for them.

The immigrants who came for economic reasons contributed to the strength of the new society in several ways. Those who came from countries with advanced political and economic institutions brought with them faith in those institutions and experience in making them work. They also brought technical and managerial skills which contributed greatly to economic growth in the new land. Above all, they helped give America the extraordinary social mobility which is the essence of an open society.

In the community he had left, the immigrant usually had a fixed place. He would carry on his father's craft or trade; he would farm his father's land, or that small portion of it that was left to him after it was divided with his brothers. Only with the most exceptional talent and enterprise could he break out of the mold in which life had cast him. There was no such mold for him in the New World. Once having broken with the past, except for sentimental ties and cultural inheritance, he had to rely on his own abilities. It was the future and not the past to which he was compelled to address himself. Except for the Negro slave, he could go anywhere and do anything his talents permitted. A sprawling continent lay before him, and he had only to weld it together by canals, by railroads and by roads. If he failed to achieve the dream for himself, he could still retain it for his children.

This has been the foundation of American inventiveness and ingenuity, of the multiplicity of new enterprises, and of the success in achieving the highest standard of living anywhere in the world.

These were the major forces that triggered this massive migration. Every immigrant served to reinforce and strengthen those elements in American society that had attracted him in the first place. The motives of some were commonplace. The motives of others were noble. Taken together they add up to the strengths and weaknesses of America.

The wisest Americans have always understood the significance of the immigrant. Among the "long train of abuses and usurpations" that impelled the framers of the Declaration of Independence to the fateful step of separation was the charge that the British monarch had restricted immigration: "He has endeavored to prevent the population of these States; for that reason obstructing the laws for the naturalization of foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migrations hither, and raising the conditions of new appropriations of lands."

CHAPTER 3—WAVES OF IMMIGRATION—THE PRE-REVOLUTIONARY FORCES

Immigration flowed toward America in a series of continuous waves. Every new migration gathered force, built momentum, reached a crest and then merged imperceptibly into the great tide of people already on our shores.

The name "America" was given to this continent by a German mapmaker, Martin Waldseemüller, to honor an Italian explorer, Amerigo Vesputi. The three ships which discovered America sailed under a Spanish flag, were commanded by an Italian sea captain, and included in their crews an Englishman, an Irishman, a Jew and a Negro.

Long before the colonies were settled, the Spanish and French explorers left evidences of their visits on great expanses of the American wilderness: the Spanish in a wide arc across the southern part of the country, from Florida, where they founded St. Augustine, our oldest city, in 1565, through Texas

and New Mexico, to California; the French, up and down the Mississippi and Ohio River valleys. Spanish influence can be seen today in our architecture, in the old missions, in family names and place names such as Los Angeles, San Francisco and Sacramento; the French influence is apparent in many towns and cities still bearing the names of the original settlements, such as Cadillac, Champlain and La Salle.

The first wave of settlement came with the colonists at Jamestown in 1607 and at Plymouth in 1620. It was predominantly English in origin. The urge for greater economic opportunity, together with the desire for religious freedom, impelled these people to leave their homes. Of all the groups that have come to America, these settlers had the most difficult physical environment to master, but the easiest social adjustment to make. They fought a rugged land, and that was hard. But they built a society in their own image, and never knew the hostility of the old toward the new that succeeding groups would meet.

The English, the numerical majority of the first settlers, gave America the basic foundation of its institutions: our form of government, our common law, our language, our tradition of freedom of religious worship. Some of these concepts have been modified as the Nation has grown, but the basic elements remain. Those who came later built upon these foundations. But America was settled by immigrants from many countries, with diverse national ethnic and social backgrounds.

There were both indentured servants and profit-seeking aristocrats from England. There were farmers, both propertied and bankrupt, from Ireland. There were discharged soldiers, soldiers of fortune, scholars, and intellectuals from Germany. The colonies welcomed all men, regardless of their origin or birth, so long as they could contribute to the building of the country. The Dutch settled Nieuw Amsterdam and explored the Hudson River. The Swedes came to Delaware. Polish, German, and Italian craftsmen were eagerly solicited to join the struggling Virginia colonists in Jamestown. The Germans and Swiss opened up the back country in Pennsylvania, New York, Virginia, and the Carolinas. French Huguenots took root in New England, New York, South Carolina, and Georgia. The Scots and the Irish were in the vanguard that advanced the frontier beyond the Alleghenies. When Britain conquered Nieuw Amsterdam in 1664, it offered citizenship to immigrants of 18 different nationalities.

At one time it seemed the continent might ultimately divide into three language sections: English, Spanish and French. But the English victories over the French and the purchase of territories held by the French and Spanish resulted in the creation of an indivisible country, with the same language, customs and government. Yet each ethnic strain left its own imprint on the new land.

Thus the very name of our country, "The United States of America," was borrowed from "The United States of the Netherlands." Many "typical American" activities are Dutch in origin. The immigrants from Holland brought to this country ice-skating, bowling, many forms of boating and golf (which they called kolf); they gave us waffles, cookies and that staple of the American menu, the doughnut (originally kruller). To our folklore they contributed the figure of Santa Claus and his reindeer, and the many tales of the Hudson Valley. Examples of their architecture can still be seen on the banks of the Hudson today.

French colonial immigration had two main sources. The Protestant Huguenots came here in considerable numbers after persecution resumed as the result of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685. The Cath-

September 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23601

olic "Acadians" came here after their exile from Nova Scotia in 1755 when that land fell under British rule.

The Huguenots settled in the larger trading towns of New England, later spreading down through Pennsylvania and Virginia, and in South Carolina. A Huguenot family presented Faneuil Hall, a shrine of American liberty, to the city of Boston. Many of the beautiful houses which make Charleston so picturesque today were built originally by Huguenots.

The Acadians, relatively few in numbers, scattered mostly along the eastern seaboard. But a colony of them settled in Louisiana, along the bayous to the west and north of New Orleans. They were relatively isolated, and as they grew in number, they kept their language, their customs, their faith and folklore, even abiding by the Napoleonic Code rather than English law. Today, sometimes known as "Cajuns," they provide one of the most distinctive ethnic elements on the American scene.

During and after the French Revolution of 1789, French musicians dancing master, tutors, and wigmakers, once employed by the now deposed aristocrats, added a touch of grace to the homespun life of the new nation. They introduced the French art of cooking, as well as the cotillion, the waltz, and the quadrille. French-Spanish émigrés from the West Indies made New Orleans into a great cultural and social center. The first opera to be given in America was produced in that city. The only major American city built according to a systematic plan, Washington, D.C., was designed by the French Army Engineer Maj. Pierre Charles L'Enfant.

The early Swedes, too, made their contribution to American culture—in particular, the knowledge of how to build houses from squared-off timbers. This structure was later to become the mark of the frontier, where it was known as the log cabin.

Over 2,000 Jews came to this country in pre-Revolutionary days. Most were from Spain or Portugal. Some established themselves in the Dutch colony of New Amsterdam, after winning recognition of their right to trade, travel, and live in the colony from Peter Stuyvesant. Others settled in Newport, R.I., then a thriving center of the maritime trade. Many prospered as merchants in the West India trade, which included sugar, rum, and molasses. The oldest synagogue in the United States, built in 1763, is located in Newport, R.I.

Among the earliest settlers in Pennsylvania were Welsh farmers who came here for economic reasons and out of a desire to revive Welsh nationalism. In years 1683-99, they were augmented by Welsh Quakers who came to escape religious persecution. Their presence is reflected by such place names as Bryn Mawr and Radnor, and in the sturdy farm houses of the area, still standing after almost 300 years.

The pre-Revolutionary Irish immigration is usually referred to as Scotch-Irish, since it consisted largely of Scots who had settled in Ireland during the 17th century.

These were the frontiersmen, ideally suited by their previous environment and experience to spearhead the drive against the colonial frontiers. They pushed out almost at once to the edge of the wilderness in Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Maine, and down the great valley to the Carolina Piedmont. Through them, Presbyterianism became a powerful force on the frontier. The Scotch Presbyterians founded many institutions of higher learning, beginning with Princeton in 1746.

In 1683, 18 German families arrived in Philadelphia. They were the forerunners of a substantial migration from Germany. With them there also came Swiss, Alsatians, Dutch and Bohemians. By the eve of the Revolution there were over 100,000 German immigrants and descendants of German immigrants liv-

ing in the United States. They constituted the first numerical challenge to the hitherto predominantly English population.

Some were Pietists, Moravians and Menonites, sects in some ways similar to the Quakers. They found in William Penn's colony a sympathetic climate in which they could practice their beliefs without interference.

Those of their descendants who live today in and around Lancaster County, Pa., are known as the "Pennsylvania Dutch." They have made of their land a model of conservationist farming. Nearly 300 years after they first broke ground, their land is as fertile and productive as they found it. They built the first Conestoga wagon, a vehicle which was to prove immensely useful to the settlement of the West.

Other German immigrants were members of other religious groups, such as the Amish and the Dunkards, who like to be known as "the plain people." They have changed little in their folkways and religious practices. They still wear their traditional clothing and follow traditional customs, providing, like the Cajuns, a picturesque addition to the American scene.

Although there was no large-scale Italian immigration before the Revolution, there were many Italians prominent in American life. As early as 1610, craftsmen were brought from Italy by the colony of Virginia to start a glass trade. Later, others came and planted vineyards. Georgia invited them to organize a silk industry.

In all the large cities there were Italian doctors, merchants, innkeepers and teachers. They wandered everywhere as traveling musicians, held concerts and established music schools. Our first sculptors and our first interior decorators were Italian.

Although predominantly Catholic, the Italians had their own counterpart of the Puritans, the Waldensians. They were an independent sect from the Piedmont, in the north of Italy, who were invited by the Dutch colonial government to form settlements here. Some 167 of them accepted, and in 1657 they were brought to the New World to settle a tract of land set aside for them by the New Amsterdam government.

Poles, too, were present in pre-Revolutionary America. Originally, they, too, came at the invitation of the Dutch. Most of them were farmers, but some settled in what is now New York City, where one of them, Dr. Alexander Kurcysz (Curtius), a prominent physician, founded the first Latin school. Pre-Revolutionary America also included Greeks, Russians and other Slavs, immigrants from southeastern and eastern Europe.

During the Revolutionary War itself, men came from many other lands to help the new Nation. Two Poles helped turn the tide toward victory. Thaddeus Kosciuszko, a young engineer, offered his services early. He became an aide to General Washington and a major general in the engineers. His plans are credited with winning the Battle of Saratoga, a turning point in the war. Count Casimir Pulaski rose to the rank of general, fought heroically at Brandywine, Trenton, and in other decisive engagements. He organized his own Polish Legion, ultimately giving his life to the new Nation when he died as a result of a wound received at the Battle of Savannah. A German, Baron Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben, did more than anyone else to shape the raw recruits into a disciplined army. A Frenchman, Marquis de Lafayette, has become something of an American folk hero for his part in the Revolution. He took a leading part in the campaign that led to the defeat of Cornwallis at Yorktown. The service of another Frenchman, Count de Rochambeau, who recruited over 4,000 French volunteers was almost as great.

Between a third and a half of the fighting men of the Revolutionary Army were of Scottish or Scotch-Irish descent. Many of those at Valley Forge were German.

A Pole of Portuguese-Jewish origin, Haym Salomon, risked his life to gain vital intelligence for the American cause. A Scotch-Irish immigrant, Robert Morris, helped finance the war.

Four signers of the Declaration of Independence were immigrants of Irish birth: Matthew Thornton, James Smith, George Taylor, and Edward Rutledge. The great doctrine "All men are created equal," incorporated in the Declaration by Thomas Jefferson, was paraphrased from the writing of Philip Mazzel, an Italian-born patriot and pamphleteer, who was a close friend of Jefferson. Mazzel compiled the first accurate history of the colonies, which he wrote in French so that the European nations would be able to appreciate the political, social, and economic conditions that characterized the New World.

A gravestone in the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia reads: "Here lies the remains of John Lewis, who slew the Irish lord, settled in Augusta County, located the town of Staunton, and furnished five sons to fight the battles of the American Revolution." Statements like this not only speak eloquently of the contribution of one Irish family, but represent the sacrifices of many immigrants to this country even before it had won its independence.

CHAPTER 4—WAVES OF IMMIGRATION—THE POST-REVOLUTIONARY FORCES

American independence, the spreading westward of the new nations, the beginnings of economic diversification and industrialization, all these factors gave immigration in the 19th century a new context and a new role. The gates were now flung open, and men and women in search of a new life came to these shores in ever-increasing numbers—150,000 in the 1820's, 1.7 million in the 1840's, 2.8 million in the 1870's, 5.2 million in the 1880's, 8.8 million in the first decade of the 20th century. And, as the numbers increased, the sources changed. As the English had predominated in the 17th and 18th centuries, so the Irish and Germans predominated in the first half of the 19th and the Italians and east Europeans in the last part of the 19th and the early part of the 20th centuries. Each new wave of immigration helped meet the needs of American development and made its distinctive contribution to the American character.

The Irish

The Irish were in the vanguard of the great waves of immigration to arrive during the 19th century. By 1850, after the potato famine, they had replaced England as the chief source of new settlers, making up 44 percent of the foreign born in the United States. In the century between 1820 and 1920, some 4½ million people left Ireland to come to the United States.

They were mostly country folk, small farmers, cottagers, and farm laborers. Yet they congregated mainly in cities along the eastern seaboard, for they did not have the money to travel after reaching shore. Few could read or write; some spoke only Gaelic.

The Irish were the first to endure the scorn and discrimination later to be inflicted, to some degree at least, on each successive wave of immigrants by already settled "Americans." In speech and dress they seemed foreign; they were poor and unskilled; and they were arriving in overwhelming numbers. The Irish are perhaps the only people in our history with the distinction of having a political party, the Know-Nothings, formed against them. Their religion was later also the target of the American Protective Association and, in this century, the Ku Klux Klan.

The Irish found many doors closed to them, both socially and economically. Advertisements for jobs specified: "No Irish need apply." But there was manual labor to be done, and the Irish were ready to do it. They went to work as longshoremen, as

ditchdiggers, or as construction workers. When their earnings were not enough to support their families, their wives and daughters obtained employment as servants.

Contractors usually met them at the dock. The Erie Canal, linking New York with the Great Lakes in 1825, and other canals in Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Maryland were largely built by Irish labor. But the canals soon became obsolete, and the frenzied building of railroads followed. In the three decades from 1830 to 1860, a network of 30,000 miles of rails was laid across the middle part of the country. Again Irish labor furnished the muscle. When railroad construction was pushed westward in the latter part of the century, the Irish again figured prominently, by now often as foremen and section bosses. They also provided, at the same time, a supply of cheap labor for the mills of Rhode Island and Massachusetts and the coal mines of Pennsylvania.

But as the years passed and new generations were born, things began to change. Gradually, rung by rung, the Irish climbed up the economic and social ladder. Some settled on farms, especially along the canals they had dug. But it was in the cities that they found their principal outlet, in areas in which they could demonstrate their abilities of self-expression, of administration and organization. They gravitated first into law and from that into politics and government. Having experienced for themselves the handicaps of illiteracy, they were determined that their children would have the advantages of education. To that end, they not only started parochial schools, but founded such institutions of higher learning as Notre Dame, Fordham, Holy Cross, Villanova, St. Louis University, Catholic University, and Georgetown. They became teachers, writers, journalists, labor organizers, orators, and priests. As an expanding society offered more opportunities, they swelled not only the civil service rosters, but the ranks of clerical and administrative workers in industry.

The Irish eased the way for other immigrant groups and speeded their assimilation in several ways. They firmly established the Catholic Church, originally French on this continent, as an English-speaking institution. The schools they founded offered educational opportunities to children of later immigrants of other tongues. The Irish had their own press, their own fraternal orders, and their own charitable organizations.

Irish labor leaders fought for the rights of other groups as well as their own. Workers of Irish descent helped organize the Knights of Labor, the first big national union, which was a forerunner of the American Federation of Labor.

The Germans

Between 1830 and 1930, the period of the greatest migration from Europe to the United States, Germany sent 6 million people to the United States—more than any other nation. Their migrations, increasing in numbers after 1850, overlapped the Irish, whose immigration declined.

The Germans were unique among immigrant groups in their wide dispersal, both geographically and occupationally. This was due, at least in part, to the fact that most of them came with some resources, and were not forced to cluster along the Eastern seaboard. Attracted to the United States by cheap public and railroad lands, and later by free homesteads, the German farmer helped to farm the new West and to cultivate the Mississippi Valley. German artisans, much sought after because of their skills, became an important factor in industrial expansion.

Almost every State in the Union profited from their intellectual and material contributions. Hard working and knowledgeable about agricultural methods, the Ger-

mans became propagators of scientific farming, crop rotation, soil conservation. They share with the Scandinavians the credit for turning millions of acres of wilderness into productive farmland.

The urban settlers lent a distinctive German flavor to many of our cities. Cincinnati, then known as "Queen City" of the West, Baltimore, St. Louis, Minneapolis and Milwaukee, all had substantial German populations. Milwaukee has perhaps retained its distinctive German character longer than any of the others.

In these urban centers Germans entered the fields of education, science, engineering and the arts. German immigrants founded and developed industrial enterprises in the fields of lumbering, food-processing, brewing, steelmaking, electrical engineering, planomaking, railroad and printing.

A small but significant part of the German immigration consisted of political refugees. Reaction in Germany against the reform ideas of the French Revolution had caused heavy suppression of liberal thought. There was strict censorship of the press, of public meetings and of the schools and universities. Nevertheless, a liberal movement had emerged, nurtured in the universities by young intellectuals. This movement led to unsuccessful revolutions in 1830 and 1848. The United States welcomed a large number of veterans of 1848—men of education, substance, and social standing, like Carl Schurz, the statesman and reformer, and General Franz Sigel. In addition, some of the German religious groups established utopian communities in parts of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Texas and Oregon.

German immigration reflected all the chaotic conditions of Central Europe after Napoleon: The population growth, the widespread hunger, the religious dissension and oppression. The Germans included Lutherans, Jews and Catholics, as well as free-thinkers. Their talents, training and background greatly enriched the burgeoning nation.

To the influence of the German immigrants in particular—although all minority groups contributed—we owe the reflowing of the austere Puritan imprint on our daily lives. The Puritans observed the Sabbath as a day of silence and solemnity. The Germans clung to their concept of the "continental Sunday" as a day, not only of churchgoing, but also of relaxation, of picnics, of visiting, of quiet drinking in beer gardens while listening to the music of a band.

The Christmas ritual of religious services combined with exchanging gifts around the Christmas tree is of German origin. So, too is the celebration of the New Year.

The fact that today almost every large American city has its symphony orchestra can be traced to the influence of the German migration. Leopold Damrosch and his son, Walter, helped build the famous New York Philharmonic. Originally composed mainly of German immigrant musicians and called the Germania Orchestra, it became the seed bed of similar organizations all over the country. This tradition was carried to the Midwest by Frederick Stock and to Boston by Carl Zerrahn. Others spread this form of cultural expression to additional urban centers throughout the land.

Community singing and glee clubs owe much to the German immigrant, who remembered his singing societies. The first Männerchor was founded in Philadelphia in 1835; the first Liederkreis was organized in Baltimore in 1836. Their counterparts have been a feature of the German-American community everywhere.

The ideas of German immigrants helped to shape our educational system. They introduced the kindergarten, or "children's play school." They also promoted the concept of the state-endowed university, patterned after the German university. The Univer-

sity of Michigan, founded in 1837, was the first such school to add to the philosophy of general liberal arts education an emphasis upon vocational training. The colonial concept of a university as a place to prepare gentlemen for a life of leisured culture was modified to include training in specialized skills.

The program of physical education in the schools had its roots in the Turnverein, or German gymnastic society. It was adopted and introduced to the American public by the YMCA.

German immigrant influence has been pervasive, in our language, in our mores, in our customs, and in our basic philosophy. Even the hamburger, the frankfurter, and the delicatessen, that omnipresent neighborhood institution, came to us via the German immigrants.

Although they were mostly Democrats prior to 1850, the Germans broke party lines in the decade before the Civil War and played a prominent part in the formation of the Republican Party. They were most united on two issues. They opposed the Blue Laws, and they vigorously fought the extension of slavery into new territories. Indeed, the first protest against Negro slavery came from Germantown settlers, led by Franz Pastorius, in 1688.

During the Civil War they fought on both sides. Following the Civil War, Germans infused the faltering American labor movement with new strength by organizing craft unions for printers, watchmakers, carpenters, ironworkers, locksmiths, butchers, and bakers.

Adjusting with relative ease, they did not feel the sting of ethnic discrimination until the outbreak of the First World War, when they became targets of wartime hysteria. This hysteria even caused overardent "patriots" to call sauerkraut "Liberty cabbage" and hamburger "Salsbury steak." Nonetheless, when the United States entered the war in 1917, men of German ancestry entered the Armed Forces of the United States and served with distinction.

As the Second World War drew near, Americans of German descent faced another test. Only a few joined the pro-Nazi German-American Bund, and many of those left as soon as they discovered its real nature. More "older Americans" than those of German descent could be counted in the ranks of America-Firsters. Again, after the United States was attacked, descendants of German immigrants fought with valor in our armed services.

The Scandinavians

Scandinavian immigrants left their homelands for economic rather than political or religious reasons. In America they found a political and social climate wholly compatible with their prior experience. Democratic institutions and a homogeneous society were already developing in Scandinavia, in an atmosphere of comparative tranquillity.

The seemingly limitless availability of farmland in America was an attractive prospect to land-hungry people.

The tide of Scandinavian immigration overlapped the tide of German immigration just as the Germans overlapped the Irish. The Swedes came first. They started coming about 1840, reaching their crest after 1860. Between 1840 and 1930, about 1.3 million Swedes came to the United States. In the 1880's migrations of other Scandinavians—Danes, Finns, Icelanders and principally the Norwegians—also reached their peak.

Following the Erie Canal and the Great Lakes, the Swedes pushed westward until they found a familiar landscape in the Prairie States of the upper Mississippi Valley. There they settled.

The first colony of these Swedes settled at a place they named Pine Lakes (now New Upsala), in Wisconsin, in 1841. Later colonists showed a preference for a broad

belt of land extending westward from Michigan, through Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Nebraska, Iowa, and Kansas.

Other Scandinavian migrations followed more or less the same geographical pattern, except for the Norwegians. Although not so large numerically as other immigrant groups, Norwegian immigration in proportion to their population at home was second only to the Irish. Some of the Norwegians drove far west to the Dakotas, Oregon and Washington. Norwegian immigration to the United States is estimated at 840,000; Danes at 350,000. Most Scandinavians settled in rural areas, except for the Finns, some of whom went to work in the copper mines of Michigan or the iron mines of Minnesota.

Physically hardy, conditioned by the rigors of life at home to withstand the hardships of the frontier, the Scandinavians made ideal pioneers. Ole Rølvaag, the Norwegian-American novelist, movingly chronicled their struggles in "Giants in the Earth."

Often they started their homesteading in sod huts, some of which were no more than holes in a hillside shored up with logs, with greased-paper windows. They look forward to the day they could live in a log cabin or in a house. Then began the struggle with the unrelenting forces of nature: hailstorms, droughts, blizzards, plagues of grasshoppers and locusts. But they endured.

America was an expanding continent. In urgent need of housing. It was the Swedes, familiar with the ax and the saw—called "the Swedish fiddle"—who went into the forests across the northern United States, felled the logs, slid them into the streams and sent them on their way to the mills, where they were cut into boards to provide shelter for millions of other immigrants. Norwegians and Finns were also among the loggers. On the west coast the Norwegians tended to become fishermen.

The Swedes did many other things too. In the long nights of the Swedish winter, they had learned to fashion things with their hands and had become skilled craftsmen and artisans. The "do-it-yourself" hobbyist of today is an avocational descendant of the Swedes. Manual training in our own public school system is derived from a basic course in the Swedish schools.

The Scandinavians were avid supporters of the public school system. And they contributed to the school system and to education generally in a variety of ways. The home economics courses of our public schools were introduced by Scandinavians. They also helped launch adult education programs. The 4-H clubs, now an international as well as a national institution, were originated at a farm school in Minnesota by Americans of Scandinavian descent. A number of colleges today stand as monuments to the early efforts of Norwegians and Swedes to make higher learning available. Among these are Augustana College in Illinois, Gustavus Adolphus in Minnesota, Bethany College in Kansas, and Luther College in Nebraska. All were founded by Swedish immigrants. Luther College in Iowa and St. Olaf College in Minnesota were founded by the Norwegians. They have added to our cultural life with their choral groups and singing societies.

With their background, it was inevitable that the Swedes would develop many engineers, scientists, and inventors. One of the most famous was John Ericsson, who not only designed the *Monitor*, one of the first armor-clad ships, but also perfected the screw propeller.

The Danes, who had an intimate knowledge of animal husbandry, laid the foundations of our dairy industry and early creamery cooperatives. Together with the Germans and the Swiss, they developed cheesemaking into an American industry.

Since the Danes were primarily agriculturists, it is curious that the one who made the most distinctive individual contribution was a city boy, Jacob Rills. As a crusading journalist and documentary photographer, he exposed the conditions under which other immigrants lived and worked in New York, and was instrumental in bringing about major social reforms.

Politically, Scandinavians cannot be classified into a single mold. At times they have been conservative. At times they have provided support for such liberal movements as the Farmer-Labor party, Senator Robert M. LaFollette's Progressive Party and the Non-Partisan League. Both major parties have benefited from Scandinavian political thought, and both parties have had Scandinavians in both State and Federal office.

Other immigrant groups

Toward the end of the 19th century, emigration to America underwent a significant change. Large numbers of Italians, Russians, Poles, Czechs, Hungarians, Rumanians, Bulgarians, Austrians, and Greeks began to arrive. Their coming created new problems and gave rise to new tensions.

For these people the language barrier was even greater than it had been for earlier groups, and the gap between the world they had left behind and the one to which they came was wider. For the most part, these were people of the land and, for the most part, too, they were forced to settle in the cities when they reached America. Most large cities had well-defined "Little Italys" or "Little Polands" by 1910. In the 1960 census New York City had more people of Italian birth or parentage than did Rome.

The history of cities shows that when conditions become overcrowded, when people are poor, and when living conditions are bad, tensions run high. This is a situation that feeds on itself; poverty and crime in one group breed fear and hostility in others. This, in turn, impedes the acceptance and progress of the first group, thus prolonging its depressed condition. This was the dismal situation that faced many of the southern and eastern European immigrants just as it had faced some of the earlier waves of immigrants. One New York newspaper had these intemperate words for the newly arrived Italians: "The floodgates are open. The bars are down. The sally-ports are unguarded. The dam is washed away. The sewer is choked * * * the scum of immigration is viscerating upon our shores. The horde of \$9.60 steerage slime is being siphoned upon us from Continental mud tanks."

Italy has contributed more immigrants to the United States than any country except Germany. Over 5 million Italians came to this country between 1820 and 1963. Large-scale immigration began in 1880, and almost 4 million Italian immigrants arrived in the present century.

The first Italians were farmers and artisans from northern Italy. Some planted vineyards in Vineland, N.J., in the Finger Lakes region of New York State and in California, where they inaugurated our domestic wine industry. Others settled on the periphery of cities, where they started truck gardens.

But most Italians were peasants from the south. They came because of neither religious persecution nor political repression, but simply in search of a brighter future. Population in Italy was straining the limits of the country's resources and more and more people had to eke out a living from small plots of land, held in many instances by oppressive landlords.

In many ways the experience of the later Italian immigrants parallels the story of the Irish. Mostly farmers, their lack of financial resources kept them from reaching the rural areas of the United States. Instead, they crowded into cities along the eastern sea-

board, often segregating themselves by province, even by village, in a density as high as 4,000 to the city block.

Untrained in special skills and unfamiliar with the language, they had to rely on unskilled labor jobs to earn a living. Italians thus filled the gap left by earlier immigrant groups who had now moved up the economic ladder. As bricklayers, masons, stonecutters, ditchdiggers, and hod carriers, they helped build our cities, subways and skyscrapers. They worked on the railroads and the dams, went into the coal mines, iron mines, and factories. Some found a place in urban life as small storekeepers, peddlers, shoemakers, barbers, and tailors. Wages were small and families were large. In the old country everyone worked. Here everyone worked, too. Wives went into the needle trades. Boys picked up what pennies they could as news vendors, bootblacks, and errandrunners. Through these difficult years of poverty, toil, and bewilderment, the Italians were bolstered by their adherence to the church, the strength of their family ties, Italian-language newspapers, and their fraternal orders. But they overcame obstacles of prejudice and misunderstanding quickly, and they have found places of importance in almost every phase of American life. Citizens of Italian descent are among our leading bankers, contractors, food importers, educators, labor leaders, and Government officials. Italians have made special contributions to the emergence of American culture, enriching our music, art, and architecture.

An Italian, Filippo Traetta (Phyllip Trajetta), founded the American Conservatory in Boston in 1800, and another in Philadelphia shortly thereafter. Another Italian, Lorenzo da Ponte, brought the first Italian opera troupe to New York in 1832, where it developed into a permanent institution. Italians have founded and supported the opera as an institution in New York, Chicago, San Francisco and other large cities, providing from their ranks many impresarios and singers. Italian-born music teachers and bandmasters are numerous. Arturo Toscanini, for many years leader of the New York Philharmonic, and our most distinguished conductor of recent years, was Italian-born.

Italians have also been among our most prominent sculptors, architects and artists. A West Indian and a Frenchman designed our Nation's Capital. An Italian beautified it. Constantino Brumidi painted the historical frieze in the rotunda of the Capitol Building. Other Italian painters and sculptors depicted our history in paintings, murals, friezes and statues. Historical monuments and statues up and down the country have been wrought by Italian-American sculptors. On a humbler scale, the taste and skill of Italian-American landscape gardeners and architects have placed our homes and communities in beautiful settings.

About the time the Italians began coming, other great tides of immigration from the countries of Eastern and Southeastern Europe also began arriving in the United States. In the years between 1820 and 1963 these areas, Italy included, sent over 15 million immigrants to our shores.

They came for all manner of reasons: political upheavals, religious persecution, hopes for economic betterment. They comprised a wide ethnic variety, from Lithuanians and Latvians on the Baltic to Greeks, Turks and Armenians on the eastern Mediterranean. They brought with them a bewildering variety of language, dress, custom, ideology and religious belief. To many Americans already here who had grown accustomed to a common way of life, they presented a dismaying bedlam, difficult to understand and more difficult to respond to. Indeed, because of the many changes in national boundaries and prior migrations of races within that area of Europe, there is no way of accurately reporting on them statistically.

The largest number from any of these countries of Eastern Europe were Poles, who for 125 years had been under the domination of Russia, Germany, and Austria-Hungary. Some followed the pattern of the Germans and Scandinavians, settling on individual farms or forming small rural communities which still bear Polish place names. But most gravitated to the cities. Four-fifths were Roman Catholic. Longer than most immigrant groups they kept their language, their customs, and their dances. At first, like other immigrants, they lived under substandard conditions. Gradually they, too, improved their status. They aspired to own their own homes and their own plots of land. In Hamtramck, Mich., an almost wholly Polish community, three-quarters of the residents own their own homes.

By 1963, almost 130,000 Czechs had migrated to this country. They tended to gravitate to the farming communities. It is one of these homesteads that is portrayed by Novelist Willa Cather in "My Antonia." They also formed enclaves in cities, principally in Chicago, Cleveland, and New York.

A potent force in the development of Czech life in this country has been the Sokol, a traditional cultural, social, and gymnastic society. These societies stressed high standards of physical fitness and an interest in singing, music, and literature.

The immigrants from Old Russia are estimated at almost 3½ million. Most of this wave of immigration went into the mines and factories. However, there were also many Russian intellectuals, scientists, scholars, musicians, writers, and artists, who came here usually during periods of political oppression.

Most students of the history of immigration to America make special mention of the Jews. Although they appeared as part of several of the waves of immigration, they warrant separate discussion because of their religion, culture, and historical background.

In colonial times most Jews in America were of Spanish-Portuguese origin. Throughout the 19th century most came from Germany. Beginning at the end of the 19th century they began to come in large numbers from Russia, Poland, Austria-Hungary, Rumania, and, in smaller numbers, from almost every European nation. The American-Jewish population today numbers approximately 6 million.

The Jews who came during the early 19th century were often peddlers, wandering throughout the land with their packs and their carts or settling down to open small stores. They prospered in this era of opportunity and expansion, for from these humble beginnings have grown many of our large department stores and mercantile establishments.

The exodus from Germany after 1848 brought Jewish intellectuals, philosophers, educators, political leaders, and social reformers. These shared much the same experiences as the other immigrants. "Like the Scandinavian Lutherans and the Irish Catholics," says Oscar Handlin, "they appeared merely to maintain their distinctive heritage while sharing the rights and obligations of other Americans within a free society."

At the turn of the century the Jews fleeing persecution in Russia came in such numbers that they could not be so readily absorbed into the mainstream of life as the earlier comers. They clustered in Jewish communities within the large cities, like New York.

Like the Irish and the Italians before them, they had to work at whatever they could find. Most found an outlet for their skills in the needle trades, as garment workers, hatmakers and furriers. Often they worked in sweatshops. In an effort to improve working conditions (which involved child labor and other forms of exploitation), they

joined with other immigrant workers to form, in 1900, the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union. In time, they developed the clothing industry as we know it today, centered in New York but reaching into every small town and rural area. The experience and tradition of these pioneers produced many effective leaders in the labor movement, such as Morris Hillquit, Sidney Hillman, Jacob Potofsky, and David Dubinsky.

Jewish immigrants have also made immense contributions to thought: as scholars, as educators, as scientists, as judges and lawyers, as journalists, as literary figures. Refugee scientists such as Albert Einstein and Edward Teller brought great scientific knowledge to this country.

Immigration from the Orient in the latter part of the 19th century was confined chiefly to California and the west coast. Our behavior toward these groups of newcomers represented a shameful episode in our relationships to those seeking the hospitality of our shores. They were often mobbed and stoned by native Americans. The Chinese suffered and were barred from our shores as far back as the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882. After the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, many Japanese-Americans were victimized by prejudice and unreasoning discrimination. They were arbitrarily shipped to relocation camps. It took the extraordinary battlefield accomplishments of the Nisei, Americans of Japanese descent, fighting in the U.S. Army in Europe, to help restore our perspective. While our attitude toward these citizens has been greatly improved over the years, many inequities in the law regarding oriental immigration must still be redressed.

Today many of our newcomers are from Mexico and Puerto Rico. We sometimes forget that Puerto Ricans are U.S. citizens by birth, and, therefore, cannot be considered immigrants. Nonetheless, they often receive the same discriminatory treatment and opprobrium that were faced by other waves of newcomers. The same things are said today of Puerto Ricans and Mexicans that were once said of Irish, Italians, Germans, and Jews: "They'll never adjust; they can't learn the language; they won't be absorbed."

Perhaps our brightest hope for the future lies in the lessons of the past. The people who have come to this country have made America, in the words of one perceptive writer, "a heterogeneous race but a homogeneous nation."

In sum, then, we can see that as each new wave of immigration has reached America it has been faced with problems, not only the problems that come with making new homes and learning new jobs, but, more important, the problems of getting along with people of different backgrounds and habits.

Each new group was met by the groups already in America, and adjustment was often difficult and painful. The early English settlers had to find ways to get along with the Indians; the Irish who followed were met by these "Yankees"; German immigrants faced both Yankee and Irish; and so it has gone down to the latest group of Hungarian refugees. Somehow, the difficult adjustments are made and people get down to the tasks of earning a living, raising a family, living with their new neighbors, and, in the process, building a nation.

CHAPTER 5—THE IMMIGRANT CONTRIBUTION

Oscar Handlin has said, "Once I thought to write a history of the immigrants in America. Then I discovered that the immigrants were American history." In the same sense, we cannot really speak of a particular "immigrant contribution" to America because all Americans have been immigrants or the descendants of immigrants; even the Indians, as mentioned before, migrated to the American Continent. We can only speak of people whose roots

in America are older or newer. Yet each wave of immigration left its own imprint on American society; each made its distinctive "contribution" to the building of the Nation and the evolution of American life. Indeed, if, as some of the older immigrants like to do, we were to restrict the definition of immigrants to the 42 million people who came to the United States after the Declaration of Independence, we would have to conclude that our history and our society would have been vastly different if they all had stayed at home.

As we have seen, people migrated to the United States for a variety of reasons. But nearly all shared two great hopes: the hope for personal freedom and the hope for economic opportunity. In consequence, the impact of immigration has been broadly to confirm the impulses in American life demanding more political liberty and more economic growth.

So, of the 56 signers of the Declaration of Independence, 18 were of non-English stock and 8 were first-generation immigrants. Two immigrants—the West Indian Alexander Hamilton, who was Washington's Secretary of the Treasury, and the Swiss, Albert Gallatin, who held the same office under Jefferson—established the financial policies of the young Republic. A German farmer wrote home from Missouri in 1834:

"If you wish to see our whole family living in . . . a country where freedom of speech obtains, where no spies are eavesdropping, where no simpletons criticize your every word and seek to detect therein a venom that might endanger the life of the state, the church, and the home, in short, if you wish to be really happy and independent, then come here."

Every ethnic minority, in seeking its own freedom, helped strengthen the fabric of liberty in American life.

Similarly, every aspect of the American economy has profited from the contributions of immigrants. We all know, of course, about the spectacular immigrant successes: the men who came from foreign lands, sought their fortunes in the United States and made striking contributions, industrial and scientific, not only to their chosen country but to the entire world. In 1953 the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization mentioned the following:

Industrialists: Andrew Carnegie (Scott), in the steel industry; John Jacob Astor (German), in the fur trade; Michael Cudahy (Irish), of the meatpacking industry; the Du Ponts (French), of the munitions and chemical industry; Charles L. Fleischmann (Hungarian), of the yeast business; David Sarnoff (Russian), of the radio industry; and William S. Knudsen (Danish), of the automobile industry.

Scientists and inventors: Among those whose genius has benefited the United States are Albert Einstein (German), in physics; Michael Pupin (Serbian), in electricity; Enrico Fermi (Italian), in atomic research; John Ericsson (Swedish), who invented the ironclad ship and the screw propeller; Giuseppe Bellanca (Italian) and Igor Sikorsky (Russian), who made outstanding contributions to airplane development; John A. Udden (Swedish), who was responsible for opening the Texas oil fields; Lucas P. Kyrides (Greek), industrial chemistry; David Thomas (Welsh), who invented the hot blast furnace; Alexander Graham Bell (Scott), who invented the telephone; Conrad Hubert (Russian), who invented the flashlight; and Ottomar Mergenthaler (German), who invented the linotype machine.

But the anonymous immigrant played his indispensable role, too. Between 1880 and 1920 America became the industrial and agricultural giant of the world as well as the world's leading creditor nation. This could not have been done without the hard labor, the technical skills and the entrepreneurial

ability of the 23.5 million people who came to America in this period.

Significant as the immigrant role was in politics and in the economy, the immigrant contribution to the professions and the arts was perhaps even greater. Charles O. Paulin's analysis of the "Dictionary of American Biography" shows that, of the 18th- and 19th-century figures, 20 percent of the businessmen, 20 percent of the scholars and scientists, 23 percent of the painters, 24 percent of the engineers, 28 percent of the architects, 29 percent of the clergymen, 46 percent of the musicians, and 61 percent of the actors were of foreign birth—a remarkable measure of the impact of immigration on American culture. And not only have many American writers and artists themselves been immigrants or the children of immigrants, but immigration has provided American literature with one of its major themes.

Perhaps the most pervasive influence of immigration is to be found in the innumerable details of life and the customs and habits brought by millions of people who never became famous. This impact was felt from the bottom up, and these contributions to American institutions may be the ones which most intimately affect the lives of all Americans.

In the area of religion, all the major American faiths were brought to this country from abroad. The multiplicity of sects established the American tradition of religious pluralism and assured to all the freedom of worship and separation of church and state pledged in the Bill of Rights.

So, too, in the very way we speak, immigration has altered American life. In greatly enriching the American vocabulary, it has been a major force in establishing "the American language," which, as H. L. Mencken demonstrated thirty years ago, had diverged materially from the mother tongue as spoken in Britain. Even the American dinner table has felt the impact. One writer has suggested that "typical American menus" might include some of the following dishes: "Irish stew, chop suey, goulash, chili con carne, ravioli, knockwurst mit sauerkraut, Yorkshire pudding, Welsh rarebit, borscht, gefilte fish, Spanish omelet, caviar, mayonnaise, antipasto, baumkuchen, English muffins, Gruyère cheese, Danish pastry, Canadian bacon, hot tamales, wiener schnitzel, petits fours, spumone, bouillabaisse, maté, scones, Turkish coffee, minestrone, flet mignon."

Immigration plainly was not always a happy experience. It was hard on the newcomers, and hard as well on the communities to which they came. When poor, ill-educated and frightened people disembarked in a strange land, they often fell prey to native racketeers, unscrupulous businessmen and cynical politicians. Boss Tweed said, characteristically, in defense of his own depredations in New York in the 1870's, "This population is too hopelessly split into races and factions to govern it under universal suffrage, except by bribery of patronage, or corruption."

But the very problems of adjustment and assimilation presented a challenge to the American idea—a challenge which subjected that idea to stern testing and eventually brought out the best qualities in American society. Thus the public school became a powerful means of preparing the newcomers for American life. The ideal of the "melting pot" symbolized the process of blending many strains into a single nationality, and we have come to realize in modern times that the "melting pot" need not mean the end of particular ethnic identities or traditions. Only in the case of the Negro has the melting pot failed to bring a minority into the full stream of American life. Today we are belatedly, but resolutely, engaged in ending this condition of national exclu-

sion and shame and abolishing forever the concept of second-class citizenship in the United States.

Sociologists call the process of the melting pot social mobility. One of America's characteristics has always been the lack of a rigid class structure. It has traditionally been possible for people to move up the social and economic scale. Even if one did not succeed in moving up oneself, there was always the hope that one's children would. Immigration is by definition a gesture of faith in social mobility. It is the expression in action of a positive belief in the possibility of a better life. It has thus contributed greatly to developing the spirit of personal betterment in American society and to strengthening the national confidence in change and the future. Such confidence, when widely shared, sets the national tone. The opportunities that America offered made the dream real, at least for a good many; but the dream itself was in large part the product of millions of plain people beginning a new life in the conviction that life could indeed be better, and each new wave of immigration rekindled the dream.

This is the spirit which so impressed Alexis de Tocqueville, and which he called the spirit of equality. Equality in America has never meant literal equality of condition or capacity; there will always be inequalities in character and ability in any society. Equality has meant rather that, in the words of the Declaration of Independence, "all men are created equal * * * [and] are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights"; it has meant that in a democratic society there should be no inequalities in opportunities or in freedoms. The American philosophy of equality has released the energy of the people, built the economy, subdued the continent, shaped and reshaped the structure of government, and animated the American attitude toward the world outside.

The continuous immigration of the 19th and early 20th centuries was thus central to the whole American faith. It gave every old American a standard by which to judge how far he had come and every new American a realization of how far he might go. It reminded every American, old and new, that change is the essence of life, and that American society is a process, not a conclusion. The abundant resources of this land provided the foundation for a great nation. But only people could make the opportunity a reality. Immigration provided the human resources. More than that, it infused the Nation with a commitment to far horizons and new frontiers, and thereby kept the pioneer spirit of American life, the spirit of equality and of hope, always alive and strong. "We are the heirs of all time," wrote Herman Melville, "and with all nations we divide our inheritance."

CHAPTER 6—IMMIGRATION POLICY

From the start, immigration policy has been a prominent subject of discussion in America. This is as it must be in a democracy, where every issue should be freely considered and debated.

Immigration, or rather the British policy of clamping down on immigration, was one of the factors behind the colonial desire for independence. Restrictive immigration policies constituted one of the charges against King George III expressed in the Declaration of Independence. And in the Constitutional Convention James Madison noted, "That part of America which has encouraged them [the immigrants] has advanced most rapidly in population, agriculture and the arts." So, too, Washington in his Thanksgiving Day Proclamation of 1795 asked all Americans "humbly and fervently to beseech the kind Author of these blessings * * * to render this country more and more a safe and propitious asylum for the unfortunate of other countries."

Yet there was the basic ambiguity which older Americans have often shown toward newcomers. In 1797 a Member of Congress argued that, while a liberal immigration policy was fine when the country was new and unsettled, now that America had reached its maturity and was fully populated, immigration should stop—an argument which has been repeated at regular intervals throughout American history.

The fear of embroilment in the wars between Britain and France helped the cause of the restrictionists. In 1798 a Federalist Congress passed the Alien Act, authorizing the expulsion of foreigners "dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States" and extending the residence requirement for naturalization from 5 to 14 years. But the Alien Act, and its accompanying Sedition Act, went too far. Both acts were allowed to expire in 1801; the naturalization period went back to 5 years; and President Thomas Jefferson expressed the predominant American sentiment when he asked: "Shall we refuse to the unhappy fugitives from distress that hospitality which the savages of the wilderness extended to our fathers arriving in this land? Shall oppressed humanity find no asylum on this globe?"

But emotions of xenophobia—hatred of foreigners—and of nativism—the policy of keeping America pure (that is, of preferring old immigrants to new)—continued to thrive. The increase in the rate of immigration in the 1820's and 1830's set off new waves of hostility, directed especially against the Irish, who, as Catholics, were regarded as members of an alien conspiracy. Even Ralph Waldo Emerson could write to Thomas Carlyle about "the wild Irish element * * * led by Romanish Priests, who sympathize, of course, with despotism." Samuel F. B. Morse, the painter and inventor of the telegraph, wrote an anti-Catholic book entitled "A Foreign Conspiracy Against the Liberties of the United States." Some alarmed Americans believed that every Catholic was a foreign agent dispatched by the Pope to subvert American society. In 1834 a mob burned down the Ursuline Convent school in Charlestown, Mass. Though the leading citizens of Boston promptly denounced this act, anti-Catholic feeling persisted.

In the 1850's nativism became an open political movement. A secret patriotic society, the Order of the Star-Spangled Banner, founded about 1850, grew into the American Party, whose members were pledged to vote only for native Americans, to demand a 21-year naturalization period and to fight Roman Catholicism. When asked about their program, they were instructed to answer, "I know nothing about it," so people called them the Know-Nothings. Coming into existence at a time when the slavery issue was dissolving the older party allegiances, the Know-Nothings for a moment attracted considerable support. They elected 6 State Governors and 75 Congressmen in 1854 and got almost 25 percent of the vote for their candidate, former President Millard Fillmore, in 1856. But soon they, too, were split by the slavery issue, and the party vanished as quickly as it had appeared.

The legacy of the Know-Nothings lived beyond its life as an organization. The seeds of bigotry, fear, and hatred bore fruit again in the years after the Civil War. The Ku Klux Klan launched a campaign of terrorism against Negroes, and in the 1890's the American Protective Association tried to revive popular feeling against Catholics. Other nativists began to turn their attention to the Jews. In the meantime, agitators on the west coast denounced the "yellow peril," and Congress in 1882 passed the first of a number of laws banning Oriental immigration. Yet, except for Oriental exclusion, Congress ignored the nativist clamor, and most Ameri-

cans regarded nativism with abhorrence. When a Protestant clergyman supporting James G. Blaine in 1884 denounced the Democrats as the party of "rum, Romanism and rebellion," he provoked a reaction which may well have lost the election for Blaine, who himself had a mother of Irish Catholic descent.

The First World War led to another outbreak of nativism. A new group, adopting the program of the Know-Nothings and the name of the Ku Klux Klan, came into being, denouncing everything its members disliked—Negroes, Catholics, Jews, evolutionists, religious liberals, internationalists, pacifists—in the name of true Americanism and of "Nordic superiority." For a season, the new KKK prospered, claiming 5 million members, mostly in the South but also in Indiana, Ohio, Kansas, and Maine. But like the other nativist movements, the fall of the Klan was as dramatic as its rise. It died when a genuine crisis, the depression, turned people's attention away from the phony issue of racism to the real problems facing the Nation. In later years, the Jew succeeded the Catholic as the chief target of nativist hysteria, and some Catholics, themselves so recently persecuted, now regrettably joined in the attack on the newer minorities.

America had no cause to be smug about the failure of these movements to take deep root. Nativism failed, not because the seeds were not there to be cultivated, but because American society is too complex for an agitation so narrowly and viciously conceived to be politically successful. That the nativist movements found any response at all must cause us to look searchingly at ourselves. That the response was at times so great offers cause for alarm.

Still it remains a remarkable fact that, except for the Oriental Exclusion Act, there was no governmental response till after the First World War.

Not only were newcomers allowed to enter freely, but in some periods they were actively sought after.

Inevitably, though, this mass influx of people presented problems which the Federal Government was forced to recognize. In 1882, recognizing the need for a national immigration policy, Congress enacted the first general legislation on the subject. The most important aspect of this law was that, for the first time, the Government undertook to exclude certain classes of undesirables, such as lunatics, convicts, idiots, and persons likely to become public charges. In 1891 certain health standards were added as well as a provision excluding polygamists.

From time to time additional laws were added. The only deviation from the basic policy of free, nondiscriminatory immigration was the Oriental Exclusion Act.

Under a special treaty arrangement with China, nationals of that country had been guaranteed free and unrestricted immigration to the United States. As the peak of that immigration, in 1882, there were only 40,000 arrivals; even in 1890 there were but 107,000 Chinese in America. Most of them lived in California and had proved good and useful workers and citizens. Although they had originally been welcomed to America for their services in building railroads and reclaiming the land, the conviction began to grow that Chinese labor was undermining the standards of American labor. This became virtually an obsession with many people. In the early 1870's anti-Chinese agitation in California became organized and focused under the leadership of Denis Kearney, who was, ironically, an immigrant from Ireland. A campaign of organized violence against Chinese communities took form, and the hysteria led to political pressure too violent to be resisted. President Hayes vetoed an act of Congress restricting Chinese immigration, but he did force renegotiation of the Burlingame Treaty under which the Govern-

ment of China agreed to restrict emigration voluntarily. Not satisfied with this remedy, Congress then enacted and the President signed into law a series of measures shutting off almost completely immigration from China.

Shameful as these episodes were, they were, however, only an exception to the prevailing policy. A more serious warning of things to come was sounded in 1897 when Congress, for the first time, provided a literacy test for adult immigrants. President Cleveland vetoed the measure. Presidents Taft and Wilson vetoed similar bills on the ground that literacy was a test only of educational opportunity and not of a person's ability or his potential worth as a citizen. In 1917, with tension high because of the war, Congress overrode President Wilson's veto and the literacy test became law.

The 20-year fight over the literacy test can now be seen as a significant turning point in immigration policy. Indeed, many saw it as such at that time. Finley Peter Dunne, creator of the immortal Mr. Dooley, devoted one of Mr. Dooley's dissertations in 1902 to the subject of the test; and immigration. With magnificent irony the Irish bartender says, "As a pilgrim father that missed the first boat, I must raise me claryon voice again' the invasion iv this fair land be th' paupers an' arnychists in Europe. Ye bet I must—because I'm here first * * *. In thim days America was th' refuge iv th' oppressed in all th' wurld * * *. But as I tell ye, 'tis diff'rent now. 'Tis time we put our back again' th' open dure an' keep out th' savage horde."

But there is no denying the fact that by the turn of the century the opinion was becoming widespread that the numbers of new immigrants should be limited. Those who were opposed to all immigration and all "foreigners" were now joined by those who believed sincerely, and with some basis in fact, that America's capacity to absorb immigration was limited. This movement toward restricting immigration represented a social and economic reaction, not only to the tremendous increase in immigration after 1880, but also to the shift in its main sources, to Southern, Eastern and South-eastern Europe.

Anti-immigration sentiment was heightened by World War I, and the disillusionment and strong wave of isolationism that marked its aftermath. It was in this climate, in 1921, that Congress passed and the President signed the first major law in our country's history severely limiting new immigration by establishing an emergency quota system. An era in American history had ended; we were committed to a radically new policy toward the peopling of the Nation.

The act of 1921 was an early version of the so-called national origins system. Its provisions limited immigration of numbers of each nationality to a certain percentage of the number of foreign-born individuals of that nationality resident in the United States according to the 1910 census. Nationality meant country of birth. The total number of immigrants permitted to enter under this system each year was 357,000.

In 1924, the act was revised, creating a temporary arrangement for the year 1924 to 1929, under which the national quotas for 1924 were equal to 2 percent of the number of foreign-born persons of a given nationality living in the United States in 1890, or about 164,000 people. The permanent system, which went into force in 1929, includes essentially all the elements of immigration policy that are in our law today. The immigration statutes now establish a system of annual quotas to govern immigration from each country. Under this system 156,987 quota immigrants are permitted to enter the United States each year. The quotas from each country are based upon the national origins of the population of the United States in 1920.

The use of the year 1920 is arbitrary. It rests upon the fact that this system was introduced in 1924 and the last prior census was in 1920. The use of a national origins system is without basis in either logic or reason. It neither satisfies a national need nor accomplishes an international purpose. In an age of interdependence among nations such a system is an anachronism, for it discriminates among applicants for admission into the United States on the basis of accident of birth.

Because of the composition of our population in 1920, the system is heavily weighted in favor of immigration from Northern Europe and severely limits immigration from southern and eastern Europe and from other parts of the world.

To cite some recent examples: Great Britain has an annual quota of 65,361 immigration visas and used 28,291 of them. Germany has a quota of 25,814, and used 26,533 (of this number, about one-third are wives of servicemen who could enter on a nonquota basis). Ireland's quota is 17,756 and only 6,054 Irish availed themselves of it. On the other hand, Poland is permitted 6,488, and there is a backlog of 61,293 Poles wishing to enter the United States. Italy is permitted 5,666 and has a backlog of 132,435. Greece's quota is 308; her backlog is 96,538. Thus a Greek citizen desiring to emigrate to this country has little chance of coming here. And an American citizen with a Greek father or mother must wait at least 18 months to bring his parents here to join him. A citizen whose married son or daughter, or brother or sister, is Italian cannot obtain a quota number for them for 2 years or more. Meanwhile, many thousands of quota numbers are wasted because they are not wanted or needed by nationals of the countries to which they are assigned.

In short, a qualified person born in England or Ireland who wants to emigrate to the United States can do so at any time. A person born in Italy, Hungary, Poland, or the Baltic States may have to wait many years before his turn is reached. This system is based upon the assumption that there is some reason for keeping the origins of our population in exactly the same proportions as they existed in 1920. Such an idea is at complete variance with the American traditions and principles that the qualifications of an immigrant do not depend upon his country of birth, and violates the spirit expressed in the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal.

One writer has listed six motives behind the act of 1924. They were: (1) postwar isolationism; (2) the doctrine of the alleged superiority of Anglo-Saxon and Teutonic "races"; (3) the fear that "pauper labor" would lower wage levels; (4) the belief that people of certain nations were less law abiding than others; (5) the fear of foreign ideologies and subversion; (6) the fear that entrance of too many people with different customs and habits would undermine our national and social unity and order. All of these arguments can be found in congressional debates on the subject and may be heard today in discussions over a new national policy toward immigration. Thus far, they have prevailed. The policy of 1924 was continued in all its essentials by the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

There have been some minor amendments to that act. In 1957 legislation was passed to reunite families being separated by restrictive provisions of the immigration legislation. Under it approximately 80,000 persons have been admitted. Among them are the wives, husbands, parents, or children of American citizens, or escapees and refugees from Communist persecution. In 1958 the immigration laws were amended to give the Attorney General added discretionary powers to adjust the status of people admitted as aliens. A 1959 amendment further facilitated the reunion of families, and a 1960

September 20, 1965

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000100040001-6

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23607

amendment provided for U.S. participation in the resettlement of certain refugee-escapees. In 1961 a special status was granted orphans coming to this country for adoption by American parents.

CHAPTER 7—WHERE WE STAND

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 undertook to codify all our national laws on immigration. This was a proper and long overdue task. But it was not just a housekeeping chore. In the course of the deliberation over the act, many basic decisions about our immigration policy were made. The total racial bar against the naturalization of Japanese, Koreans, and other East Asians was removed, and a minimum annual quota of 100 was provided for each of these countries. Provision was also made to make it easier to reunite husbands and wives. Most important of all was the decision to do nothing about the national origins system.

The famous words of Emma Lazarus on the pedestal of the Statue of Liberty read: "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses, yearning to breathe free." Until 1921 this was an accurate picture of our society. Under present law it would be appropriate to add: "as long as they come from Northern Europe, are not too tired or too poor or slightly ill, never stole a loaf of bread, never joined any questionable organization, and can document their activities for the past 2 years."

Furthermore, the national origins quota system has strong overtones of an indefensible racial preference. It is strongly weighted toward so-called Anglo-Saxons, a phrase which one writer calls "a term of art" encompassing almost anyone from Northern and Western Europe. Sinclair Lewis described his hero, Martin Arrowsmith, this way: "a typical purebred Anglo-Saxon American—which means that he was a union of German, French, Scotch-Irish, perhaps a little Spanish, conceivably of the strains lumped together as 'Jewish,' and a great deal of English, which is itself a combination of primitive Britain, Celtic, Phoenician, Roman, German, Dane, and Swede."

Yet, however much our present policy may be deplored, it still remains our national policy. As President Truman said when he vetoed the Immigration and Nationality Act (only to have that veto overridden): "The idea behind this discriminatory policy was, to put it boldly, that Americans with English or Irish names were better people and better citizens than Americans with Italian or Greek or Polish names. . . . Such a concept is utterly unworthy of our traditions and our ideals."

Partly as a result of the inflexibility of the national origins quota system, the Government has had to resort to temporary expedients to meet emergency situations. The 1967 Kennedy amendment, which permitted alien spouses, parents, and children with inconsequential disqualifications to enter the United States, was responsive to this need. In 1948 Congress passed the Displaced Persons Act allowing more than 400,000 people made homeless by the war to come to this country. In 1953 Congress passed the Refugee Relief Act to admit about 200,000 people, most of whom had fled from behind the Iron Curtain. Under this act and under a clause of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, not originally intended for use in such situations, some 30,000 freedom fighters from Hungary were admitted in 1957. As a result it became necessary to pass a special law in 1958 to regularize the status of many of these immigrants.

Following the 1968 earthquakes in the Azores which left so many Portuguese homeless, none of these people could enter the United States as quota immigrants. Persons

of Dutch origin in The Netherlands who were displaced from Indonesia were also ineligible to enter the United States as quota immigrants. Both needs were met by the Pastore-Kennedy-Walter Act of 1958 admitting a number of them on a nonquota basis into the United States. In 1962 a special law had to be passed to permit the immigration of several thousand Chinese refugees who had escaped from Communist China to Hong Kong. The same legislative procedure was used as in the 1967 Hungarian program. Each world crisis is met by a new exception to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. Each exception reflects the natural humanitarian impulses of the American people, which is in keeping with our traditions of shelter to the homeless and refuge for the oppressed.

While none of these measures are, of themselves, especially generous responses to the tremendous problems to which they are addressed, they all have a great impact on our foreign policy. They demonstrate that there is still a place in America for people fleeing from tyranny or natural calamity. Nevertheless, the effect of these actions is diluted by the very fact that they are viewed as exceptions to our national policy rather than as a part of that policy.

Another measure of the inadequacy of the Immigration and Nationality Act has been the huge volume of private immigration bills introduced in Congress. These are bills to deal with individual hardship cases for which the general law fails to provide. In the 87th Congress over 3,500 such bills were introduced. Private immigration bills make up about half of our legislation today.

It is not hard to see why. A poor European college girl was convicted three times for putting slugs in a pay telephone, and 15 years later, married to an American teacher abroad, she was denied entrance to our country because of three separate convictions for a crime involving moral turpitude. Or another case. An Italian immigrant living in Massachusetts with his small children could not bring his wife to the United States because she had been convicted on two counts involving moral turpitude. Her crimes? In 1913 and 1939 she had stolen bundles of sticks to build a fire. It took acts of Congress to reunite both these families.

These are examples of the inadequacies of the present law. They are important of themselves because people's lives are affected by them. But they are more important for what they represent of the way America looks at the world and the way America looks at itself.

There is, of course, a legitimate argument for some limitation upon immigration. We no longer need settlers for virgin lands, and our economy is expanding more slowly than in the 19th and early 20th centuries. A superficial analysis of the neated arguments over immigration policy which have taken place since 1952 might give the impression that there was an irreconcilable conflict, as if one side wanted to go back to the policy of our founding fathers, of unrestricted immigration, and the other side wanted to stop all further immigration. In fact, there are only a few basic differences between the most liberal bill offered in recent years, sponsored by former Senator Herbert H. Lehman, and the supporters of the status quo. The present law admits 156,700 quota immigrants annually. The Lehman bill (like a bill introduced by Senator PHILIP A. HART and cosponsored by over one-third of the Members of the Senate) would admit 250,000.

The clash of opinion arises not over the number of immigrants to be admitted, but over the test for admission—the national origins quota system. Instead of using the discriminatory test of where the immigrant was born, the reform proposals would base

admission on the immigrant's possession of skills our country needs and on the humanitarian ground of reuniting families. Such legislation does not seek to make over the face of America. Immigrants would still be given tests for health, intelligence, morality, and security.

The force of this argument is recognized by the special measures enacted since 1952 which have ignored the established pattern of favoring Northern and Western Europe immigration over Southern and Eastern European countries. These statutes have resulted in the admission of a great many more persons from Southern European countries than would have been possible under the McCarran-Walter Act.

But more than a decade has elapsed since the last substantial amendment to these laws. There is a compelling need for Congress to reexamine and make changes in them.

Religious and civic organizations, ethnic associations, and newspaper editorials, citizens from every walk of life and groups of every description have expressed their support for a more rational and less prejudiced immigration law. Congressional leaders of both parties have urged the adoption of new legislation that would eliminate the most objectionable features of the McCarran-Walter Act and the nationalities quota system.

It is not only the initial assignment of quota numbers which is arbitrary and unjust; additional inequity results from the failure of the law to permit full utilization of the authorized quota numbers. The tiny principality of Andorra in the Pyrenees Mountains, with 6,500 Spanish-speaking inhabitants, has an American immigration quota of 100, while Spain, with 28 million people, has a quota of only 250. While American citizens wait for years for their relatives to receive a quota, approximately 60,000 numbers are wasted each year because the countries to which they are assigned have far more numbers allocated to them than they have emigrants seeking to move to the United States. There is no way at present in which these numbers can be reassigned to nations where immense backlogs of applicants for admission to the United States have accumulated. This deficiency in the law should be corrected.

A special discriminatory formula is now applied to the immigration of persons who are attributable by their ancestry to an area called the Asia-Pacific triangle. This area embraces all countries from Pakistan to Japan and the Pacific islands north of Australia and New Zealand. Usually, the quota under which a prospective immigrant must enter is determined by his place of birth. However, if as much as one-half of an immigrant's ancestors came from nations in the Asia-Pacific triangle, he must rely upon the small quota assigned to the country of his ancestry, regardless of where he was born. This provision of the law should be repealed.

The Presidential message to Congress of July 23, 1963, recommended that the national origins system be replaced by a formula governing immigration to the United States which takes into account: (1) the skills of the immigrant and their relationships to our needs; (2) the family relationship between immigrants and persons already here, so that the reuniting of families is encouraged; and (3) the priority of registration. Present law grants a preference to immigrants with special skills, education, or training. It also grants a preference to various relatives of the United States citizens and lawfully resident aliens. But it does so only with a national origins quota. It should be modified so that those with the greatest ability to add to the national welfare, no matter where they are born, are granted the highest priority. The next

23608

priority should go to those who seek to be reunited with their relatives. For applicants with equal claims, the earliest registrant should be the first admitted.

In order to remove other existing barriers to the reuniting of families, two additional improvements in the law are needed.

First, parents of American citizens, who now have a preferred quota status, should be accorded nonquota status.

Second, parents of aliens resident in the United States, who now have no preference, should be accorded a preference, after skilled specialists and other relatives of citizens and alien residents.

These changes will have little effect on the number of immigrants admitted. They will have a major effect insofar as they relieve the hardship many of our citizens and residents now face in being separated from their parents.

These changes will not solve all the problems of immigration. But they will insure that progress will continue to be made toward our ideals and toward the realization of humanitarian objectives.

We must avoid what the Irish Poet John Boyle O'Reilly once called:

"Organized charity, scrimped and iced,
In the name of a cautious, statistical
Christ."

Immigration policy should be generous; it should be fair; it should be flexible. With such a policy we can turn to the world, and to our own past, with clean hands and a clear conscience. Such a policy would be but a reaffirmation of old principles. It would be an expression of our agreement with George Washington that "The bosom of America is open to receive not only the opulent and respectable stranger, but the oppressed and persecuted of all nations and religions; whom we shall welcome to a participation of all our rights and privileges, if by decency and propriety of conduct they appear to merit the enjoyment."

APPENDIX A

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A NATION OF IMMIGRANTS

The map on the following pages (not printed in the Record) indicates the general distribution of immigrant groups in the United States. All told, more than 42 million immigrants have come to our shores since the beginning of our history as a nation. Why they came here and what they did after they arrived make up the story of America. They came for a variety of reasons from every quarter of the world, representing almost every race, almost every religion, and almost every creed. Through their ingenuity, their industry, and their imagination, they were able to create out of a wilderness a thriving and prosperous nation—and through their dedication to liberty and freedom, they helped to build a government reflecting man's most cherished ideals.

From Great Britain came Pilgrims, who sought freedom; Quakers, who loved their brothers but who were not allowed to love them in peace; sturdy Scots and Welsh. To date, estimated immigration from Great Britain: 4,642,096. Peak year: 1888.

The bold, imaginative Irish left their land during the years of famine for the land of opportunity. Estimated immigration from Ireland to date: 4,693,009. Peak decade: 1851-60.

From Germany came the liberals and those who fled persecution. Estimated immigration from Germany to date: 6,798,313. Peak decade: 1881-90.

Fleeing Czarist and Communist suppression, came an estimated 3,344,998 Russians, some 40 percent of them Jews fleeing persecution. Peak decade: 1901-10.

Frenchmen cried, "Let us rule ourselves; our kings are not divine." To date, estimated immigration from France, 698,188. Peak year: 1851.

The Japanese and Chinese brought their gentle dreams to the West coast. To date, estimated immigration from Japan: 338,087. Peak year: 1907. Estimated immigration from China: 411,585. Peak year: 1882.

The Greeks found soil where vineyards might flourish. To date, estimated immigration from Greece: 499,465. Peak year: 1907.

In Poland they heard of the land where freedom is. To date, estimated immigration from Poland: 451,010. Peak year: 1921.

From Austria-Hungary and Rumania whole villages banded together to find a new life. To date, estimated immigration from Austria and Hungary: 4,280,863. Peak year: 1907. To date, estimated immigration from Rumania: 159,497. Peak year: 1921.

Italians settled in the cities of the East and the valleys of the West. To date, estimated immigration from Italy: 5,017,625. Peak year: 1907.

To the Midwest the Scandinavians brought their knowledge of agriculture. To date, estimated immigration from Denmark: 354,331. Peak year: 1882. From Finland: 28,358. Peak year: 1902. From Norway: 843,867. Peak year: 1882. From Sweden: 1,255,296. Peak year: 1882.

These are some of yesterday's immigrants who have supplied a continuous flow of creative abilities and ideas that have enriched our Nation.

The immigrants we welcome today and tomorrow will carry on this tradition and help us to retain, reinvigorate and strengthen the American spirit.

APPENDIX B

CHRONOLOGY OF IMMIGRATION

In 1607: Founding of Virginia by English colonists, to "fetch treasure" and enjoy religious and happy government."

In 1619: First shipload of 20 Negro slaves arrives at Jamestown.

In 1620: Voyage of the *Mayflower*, carrying Pilgrims who welcome opportunity of "advancing the gospel of . . . Christ in those remote parts of the world."

In 1623: Settlement of New Netherland as a trading post by Dutch West India Company.

In 1630-40: Puritans migrate to New England to establish a form of government that will allow them to worship as they desire.

In 1634: Lord Baltimore founds Maryland as a refuge for English Catholics.

In 1642: Outbreak of English Civil War and decrease in Puritan migration.

In 1649: Passage of Maryland Toleration Act, extending toleration to all bodies professing trinitarian Christianity.

In 1654: First Jewish immigrants to reach North America arrive at New Amsterdam fleeing Portuguese persecution in Brazil.

In 1660: Emigration from England officially discouraged by government of Charles II, acting on mercantilist doctrine that the wealth of a country depends on number of its inhabitants.

In 1670: Settlement of the Carolinas by a group of English courtiers, anxious to promote national self-sufficiency—and their own fortunes.

In 1681: Founding of Pennsylvania by the Quakers, as William Penn's "holy experiment" in universal philanthropy and brotherhood.

In 1683: First German settlers, Mennonites, to reach New World arrive in Pennsylvania, in a desire to withdraw from the world and live peaceably according to the tenets of their faith.

In 1685: Revocation of Edict of Nantes by Louis XIV, culmination of growth of religious intolerance in France, leads to arrival of small but important group of Huguenots. Most settle in South Carolina.

In 1697: Royal African Company's monopoly of slave trade ends and the business of slavery expands rapidly. New Englanders find it extremely profitable.

In 1707: Act of Union between England and Scotland begins a new era of Scottish migration. Scots settle as merchants and factors in colonial seaports; lowland artisans and laborers leave Glasgow to become indentured servants in tobacco colonies and New York.

In 1709: Exodus from German Palatinate in wake of devastation wreaked by wars of Louis XIV. Palatines settle in Hudson Valley and Pennsylvania.

In 1717: Act of English Parliament legalizes transportation to American colonies as punishment; contractors begin regular shipments from jails, most (of some 30,000) to Virginia and Maryland.

In 1718: Large-scale Scotch-Irish immigration begins, sparked by discontent with old country land system: absentee landlords, high rents, short leases. Most settle first in New England, then in Maryland and Pennsylvania.

In 1730: Colonization of Virginia valley and Carolina back country by Germans (Pietist and pacifist sectarians) and Scotch-Irish from Pennsylvania.

In 1732: Georgia founded by James Oglethorpe, as a buffer against Spanish and French attack, as a producer of raw silk and as a haven for imprisoned debtors. (Silk scheme fails; only a handful of debtors come.)

In 1740: Parliament enacts Naturalization Act conferring British citizenship on alien immigrants to colonies in hope of encouraging Jewish immigration. Jews enjoy a greater degree of political and religious freedom in the American colonies than anywhere in the world.

In 1745: Jacobite rebellion in Scotland to put Stuarts back on throne fails. Some rebels transported to American colonies as punishment.

In 1755: Expulsion of French Acadians from Nova Scotia on suspicion of disloyalty. Survivors settle in Louisiana.

In 1771-73: Depression in Ulster linen trade and acute agrarian crises bring new influx of Scotch-Irish, around 10,000 annually.

In 1775: British Government suspends emigration on outbreak of hostilities in America.

In 1783: Treaty of Paris ends Revolutionary War. Revival of immigration; most numerous group: Scotch-Irish.

In 1789: Outbreak of French Revolution. Emigration to the United States of aristocrats and royalist sympathizers.

In 1791: Negro revolt in Santo Domingo; 10,000-20,000 French exiles take refuge in the United States, principally in towns on the Atlantic seaboard.

In 1793: Wars of the French Revolution send Girondists and Jacobins threatened by guillotine to the United States.

In 1798: Unsuccessful Irish rebellion; rebels emigrate to the United States, as do distressed artisans and yeoman farmers and agricultural laborers depressed by bad harvests and low prices.

Allen and Sedition Acts give President arbitrary powers to seize and expel resident aliens suspected of engaging in subversive activities. Though never invoked, acts induce several shiploads of Frenchmen to return to France and Santo Domingo.

In 1803: Resumption of war between England and France. Disrupting of transatlantic trade; emigration from continental Europe practically impossible.

British Passenger Act limits numbers to be carried by emigrant ships, effectively checks Irish emigration.

In 1807: Congress prohibits importing of Negro slaves into the United States (prohibited by Delaware in 1776; Virginia, 1778; Maryland, 1783; South Carolina, 1787; North Carolina, 1794; Georgia, 1798; reopened by South Carolina in 1803).

In 1812: War of 1812 brings immigration to a complete halt.

In 1814: Treaty of Ghent ends War of 1812. Beginning of first great wave of immigration: 5 million immigrants between 1815 and 1860.

In 1818: Black Ball Line of sailing packets begins regular Liverpool-New York service; Liverpool becomes main port of departure for Irish and British, as well as considerable numbers of Germans and Norwegians.

In 1825: Great Britain repeals laws prohibiting emigration as ineffective; official endorsement of view that England is overpopulated.

Arrival in United States of first group of Norwegian immigrants in sloop *Restaurationen*, consisting of freeholders leaving an overpopulated country and shrunken farms. They are followed by cotters, laborers and servants.

In 1830: Polish revolution. Thirty-six sections of public land in Illinois allotted by Congress to Polish revolutionary refugees.

In 1837: Financial panic. Nativists complain that immigration lowers wage levels, contributes to the decline of the apprenticeship system and generally depresses the condition of labor.

In 1840: Cunard Line founded. Beginning of era of steamship lines especially designed for passenger transportation between Europe and the United States.

In 1845: Native American Party founded, with minimal support in 14 States; precursor of nativist, anti-immigrant Know-Nothing Party which reached its peak in 1855, when it elected six Governors, dominated several State legislatures and sent a sizable delegation to Congress.

In 1846: Crop failures in Germany and Holland. Mortgage foreclosures and forced sales send tens of thousands of dispossessed to United States.

In 1846-47: Irish potato famine. Large scale emigration to the United States of all classes of Irish population, not only laborers and cotters, but even substantial farmers.

In 1848: Revolution in Germany. Failure of revolution results in emigration of political refugees to America.

In 1855: Opening of Castle Garden immigrant depot in New York. City to process mass immigration.

In 1856: Collapse of Know-Nothing movement in presidential election; candidate Millard Fillmore carries only one State.

Irish Catholic Colonization Convention at Buffalo, N.Y., to promote Irish rural colonization in the United States. Strongly opposed by eastern bishops, movement proves unsuccessful.

In 1861-65: Large numbers of immigrants serve on both sides during American Civil War.

In 1882: First Federal immigration law bars lunatics, idiots, convicts and those likely to become public charges.

Chinese Exclusion Act denies entry to Chinese laborers for a period of 10 years (renewed in 1892; Chinese immigration suspended indefinitely in 1902; many return home).

Outbreak of anti-Semitism in Russia; sharp rise in Jewish migration to United States.

In 1885: Foran Act prohibits importing of contract labor, but not of skilled labor for new industries, artists, actors, lecturers, domestic servants; individuals in United States not to be prevented from assisting immigration of relatives and personal friends.

In 1886: Statue of Liberty dedicated, just when the resistance to unrestricted immigration begins to mount.

In 1890: Superintendent of the Census announces disappearance of the frontier.

In 1891: Congress adds health qualifications to immigration restrictions.

Pogroms in Russia. Large Jewish immigration to United States.

In 1892: Ellis Island replaces Castle Garden as a reception center for immigrants.

In 1893: Economic depression brings a vast accession of strength to anti-Catholic American Protective Association.

In 1894: Immigration Restriction League organized, to be the spearhead of restrictionist movement for next 25 years. Emphasizes distinction between "old" (Northern and Western European) and "new" (Southern and Eastern European) immigrants.

In 1894-96: Massacres of Armenian Christians by Moslems set emigration to United States in motion.

In 1897: Literacy test for immigrants vetoed by President Cleveland.

In 1903: Immigration law denies entry, inter alia, to anarchists or persons believing in the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States, or any government, or in the assassination of public officials (as a result of President McKinley's assassination by the American-born anarchist, Leon Czolgosz).

In 1905: Japanese and Korean Exclusion League formed by organized labor in protest against influx of coolie labor and in fear of threat to the living standards of American workmen.

In 1907-08: Gentleman's agreement, whereby Japanese Government undertakes to deny passports to laborers going directly from Japan to United States, fails to satisfy west coast exclusionists.

In 1913: California Legislature passes alien land law, effectively barring Japanese, as "aliens ineligible for citizenship," from owning agricultural land in the State.

In 1914-18: World War I. End of period of mass migration to the United States.

In 1916: Madison Grant's "The Passing of the Great Race" calls for exclusion, on racial grounds, of "inferior" Alpine, Mediterranean, and Jewish breeds.

In 1917: Literacy test for immigrants finally adopted after being defeated in Congress in 1896, 1898, 1902, 1906, vetoed in 1897 by President Cleveland, in 1913 by President Taft, and in 1915 and 1917 by President Wilson. It was passed by overriding the second veto by President Wilson.

In 1919: Big Red scare: anti-foreign fears and hatreds transferred from German-Americans to alien revolutionaries and radicals. Thousands of alien radicals seized in Palmer raids, hundreds deported.

In 1921: Emergency immigration restriction law introduces quota system, heavily weighted in favor of natives of Northern and Western Europe, all but slamming the door on Southern and Eastern Europeans. Immediate slump in immigration.

In 1923: Ku Klu Klan, at heart a virulently anti-immigrant movement, reaches its peak strength.

In 1924: National Origins Act adopted, settling ceiling on number of immigrants, and establishing discriminatory national-racial quotas.

In 1929: National Origins Act becomes operative. Stock market crash. Demands that immigration be further reduced during economic crisis lead Hoover administration to order rigorous enforcement of prohibition against admission of persons liable to be public charges.

In 1933: Hitler becomes German Chancellor; anti-Semitic campaign begins. Jewish refugees from Nazi Germany come to United States, though barriers imposed by the quota system are not lifted.

In 1934: Philippine Independence Act restricts Philippine immigration to an annual quota of 50.

In 1939: World War II begins.

In 1941: United States enters war. All immigrant groups support united war effort.

In 1942: Evacuation of Japanese-Americans from Pacific Coast to detention camps, victims of deep-seated suspicion and animosity, and unjustified fear of espionage and sabotage.

In 1945: Large-scale Puerto Rican migra-

tion to escape poverty on island. Many settle in New York.

In 1946: War Brides Act provides for admission of foreign-born wives of American servicemen.

In 1948: Displaced Persons Act (amended in 1950) provides for admission of 400,000 refugees during a 4-year period: three-quarters regular displaced persons from countries with low quotas, one-quarter Volksdeutsche (ethnic Germans), special groups of Greek, Polish, and Italian refugees, orphans and European refugees stranded in the Far East.

In 1952: Immigration and Naturalization Act, codifying existing legislation, makes the quota system even more rigid and repressive, except for a token quota granted those in the Asia-Pacific triangle.

In 1953-56: Refugee Relief Act grants visas to some 5,000 Hungarians after 1956 revolution; President Eisenhower invites 30,000 more to come in on parole.

In 1954: Ellis Island closed. Symbol of ending of mass migration.

In 1957: Special legislation to admit Hungarian refugees.

In 1959: Castro revolution successful in Cuba.

In 1960: Cuban refugees paroled into United States.

In 1962: Special permission for admission of refugees from Hong Kong.

In 1963: Congress urged by President Kennedy to pass new legislation eliminating national origins quota system.

(Appendix C: "Suggested Reading" has been omitted.)

APPENDIX D

TEXT OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY'S PROPOSALS TO LIBERALIZE IMMIGRATION STATUTES (JULY 23, 1963)

I am transmitting herewith, for the consideration of the Congress, legislation revising and modernizing our immigration laws. More than a decade has elapsed since the last substantial amendment to these laws. I believe there exists a compelling need for the Congress to reexamine and make certain changes in these laws.

The most urgent and fundamental reform I am recommending relates to the national origins system of selecting immigrants. Since 1924 it has been used to determine the number of quota immigrants permitted to enter the United States each year. Accordingly, although the legislation I am transmitting deals with many problems which require remedial action, it concentrates attention primarily upon revision of our quota immigration system. The enactment of this legislation will not resolve all of our important problems in the field of immigration law. It will, however, provide a sound basis upon which we can build in developing an immigration law that serves the national interest and reflects in every detail the principles of equality and human dignity to which our Nation subscribes.

Elimination of discrimination based on national origins

Present legislation establishes a system of annual quotas to govern immigration from each country. Under this system, 156,700 quota immigrants are permitted to enter the United States each year. The system is based upon the national origins of the population of the United States in 1920. The use of the year 1920 is arbitrary. It rests upon the fact that this system was introduced in 1924 and the last prior census was in 1920. The use of a national origins system is without basis in either logic or reason. It neither satisfies a national need nor accomplishes an international purpose. In an age of interdependence among nations, such a system is an anachronism, for it discriminates among applicants for admission into the United States on the basis of accident of birth.

Because of the composition of our population in 1920, the system is heavily weighted in favor of immigration from northern Europe and severely limits immigration from southern and eastern Europe and from other parts of the world. An American citizen with a Greek father or mother must wait at least 18 months to bring his parents here to join him. A citizen whose married son or daughter, or brother or sister, is Italian cannot obtain a quota number for an even longer time. Meanwhile, many thousands of quotas numbers are wasted because they are not wanted or needed by nationals of the countries to which they are assigned.

I recommend that there be substituted for the national origins system a formula governing immigration to the United States which takes into account (1) the skills of the immigrant and their relationship to our need; (2) the family relationship between immigrants and persons already here, so that the reuniting of families is encouraged; and (3) the priority of registration. Present law grants a preference to immigrants with special skills, education, or training. It also grants a preference to various relatives of U.S. citizens and lawfully resident aliens. But it does so only within a national origins quota. It should be modified so that those with the greatest ability to add to the national welfare, no matter where they were born, are granted the highest priority. The next priority should go to those who seek to be reunited with their relatives. As between applicants with equal claims the earliest registrant should be the first admitted.

Many problems of fairness and foreign policy are involved in replacing a system so long entrenched. The national origins system has produced large backlogs of applications in some countries, and too rapid a change might, in a system of limited immigration, so drastically curtail immigration in some countries the only effect might be to shift the unfairness from one group of nations to another. A reasonable time to adjust to any new system must be provided if individual hardships upon persons who were relying on the present system are to be avoided. In addition, any new system must have sufficient flexibility to allow adjustments to be made when it appears that immigrants from nations closely allied to the United States will be unduly restricted in their freedom to furnish the new seed population that has so long been a source of strength to our Nation.

PROPOSAL IN DETAIL

Accordingly, I recommend:

First, that existing quotas be reduced gradually, at the rate of 20 percent a year. The quota numbers released each year would be placed in a quota reserve pool, to be distributed on the new basis.

Second, that natives of no one country receive over 10 percent of the total quota numbers authorized in any one year. This will insure that the pattern of immigration is not distorted by excessive demand from any one country.

Third, that the President be authorized, after receiving recommendations from a seven-man Immigration Board, to reserve up to 60 percent of the unallocated quota numbers for issuance to persons disadvantaged by the change in the quota system, and up to 20 percent to refugees whose sudden dislocation requires special treatment. The Immigration Board will be composed of two members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two members appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and three members appointed by the President. In addition to its responsibility for formulating recommendations regarding the use of the quota reserve pool, the Board will make a continuous study of our immigration policy.

ALL QUOTA NUMBERS USED

But it is not alone the initial assignment of quota numbers which is arbitrary and unjust; additional inequity results from the failure of the law to permit full utilization of the authorized quota numbers. While American citizens wait for years for their relatives to receive a quota, approximately 60,000 quota numbers are wasted each year because the countries to which they are assigned have far more numbers allocated to them than they have emigrants seeking to move to the United States. There is no way at present in which these numbers can be reassigned to Nations where immense backlogs of applicants for admission to the United States have accumulated. I recommend that this deficiency in the law be corrected.

ASIA-PACIFIC TRIANGLE

A special discriminatory formula is now used to regulate the immigration of persons who are attributable by their ancestry to an area called the Asia-Pacific triangle. This area embraces all countries from Pakistan to Japan and the Pacific Islands north of Australia and New Zealand. Usually, the quota under which a prospective immigrant must enter is determined by his place of birth. However, if as much as one-half of an immigrant's ancestors came from nations in the Asia-Pacific triangle, he must rely upon the small quota assigned to the country of his ancestry, regardless of where he was born. This provision of our law should be repealed.

OTHER PROVISIONS

In order to remove other existing barriers to the reuniting of families, I recommend two additional improvements in the law.

First, parents of American citizens, who now have a preferred quota status should be accorded nonquota status.

Second, parents of aliens resident in the United States, who now have no preference, should be accorded a preference, after skilled specialists and other relatives of citizens and alien residents.

These changes will have little effect on the number of immigrants admitted. They will have a major effect upon the individual hardships many of our citizens and residents now face in being separated from their parents.

In addition, I recommend the following changes in the law in order to correct certain deficiencies and improve its general application.

1. Changes in the preference structure. At present, the procedure under which specially skilled or trained workers are permitted to enter this country too often prevents talented people from applying for visas to enter the United States. It often deprives us of immigrants who would be helpful to our economy and our culture. This procedure should be liberalized so that highly trained or skilled persons may obtain a preference without requiring that they secure employment here before emigrating. In addition, I recommend that a special preference be accorded workers with lesser skills who can fill specific needs in short supply in this country.

2. Nonquota status for natives of Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago should be granted. Under existing law, no numerical limitation is imposed upon the number of immigrants coming from Canada, Mexico, Cuba, Haiti, the Dominican Republic, the Canal Zone, or any independent country in Central or South America. But the language of the statute restricts this privilege to persons born in countries in the Caribbean area which gained their independence prior to the date of the last major amendment to the immigration and nationality statutes, in 1952. This accidental discrimination against the newly independent nations of the Western Hemisphere should be corrected.

3. Persons afflicted with mental health

problems should be admitted provided certain standards are met. Today, any person afflicted with a mental disease or mental defect, psychotic personality, or epilepsy, and any person who has suffered an attack of mental illness, can enter this country only if a private bill is enacted for his health. Families which are able and willing to care for a mentally ill child or parent are often forced to choose between living in the United States and leaving their loved ones behind and not living in the United States but being able to see and care for their loved ones. Mental illness is not incurable. It should be treated like other illnesses. I recommend that the Attorney General, at his discretion and under proper safeguards, be authorized to waive those provisions of the law which prohibit the admission to the United States of persons with mental problems when they are close relatives of United States citizens and lawfully resident aliens.

4. The Secretary of State should be authorized, in his discretion, to require re-registration of certain quota immigrant visa applicants and to regulate the time of payment of visa fees. This authority would bring registration lists up to date, terminate the priority of applicants who have refused to accept a visa, and end the problem of "insurance" registrations by persons who have no present intention to emigrate. Registration figures for oversubscribed quota areas are now inaccurate because there exists no way of determining whether registrants have died, have emigrated to other countries, or for some other reason no longer want to emigrate to the United States. These problems are particularly acute in heavily oversubscribed areas.

CONCLUSION

As I have already indicated the measures I have outlined will not solve all the problems of immigration. Many of them will require additional legislation; some cannot be solved by any one country. But the legislation I am submitting will insure that progress will continue to be made toward our ideals and toward the realization of humanitarian objectives. The measures I have recommended will help eliminate discrimination between peoples and nations on a basis that is unrelated to any contribution that immigrants can make and is inconsistent with our traditions of welcome. Our investment in new citizens has always been a valuable source of our strength.

APPENDIX E

SELECTED COMMENTS ON PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S MESSAGE

Senator PHILIP A. HART, Democrat, of Michigan, speaking of the message on revision of the immigration laws sent to the Congress in 1963, said: "It is fitting that this proposal should come at a time when the Nation and the Congress are deeply committed to a full review of our practices and laws affecting our fellow citizens of different races. * * * Let us get on with this job."

From the other side of the Chamber, Republican Senator Kenneth B. Keating, of New York, declared: "I am very pleased that the executive branch has now made these proposals and I am sympathetic to the approach in this bill. * * * I shall certainly exert every possible effort to have such legislation enacted at this session * * * and hope that there will be prompt hearings on this important subject."

Strong support for a thoroughgoing revision of our present immigration policy came from Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, the Minnesota Democrat. He said: "Although Congress faces many urgent matters of national importance at this session and the next, I fervently hope we can nevertheless push ahead with the long-postponed long-overdue task of bringing our immigration

September 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23611

laws up to the civilized standard which the world has reason to expect of the United States. This present system is cruel, unworkable, discriminatory, and illogical."

Republican Senator HIRSH L. FONG, of Hawaii, said: "I shall strongly support efforts to basically revise our immigration laws and policies," and added that he was "heartened" by the administration's recognition of the need for a basic change in American immigration policies.

Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, said: "It is my considered opinion that this President's bill offers a broad and firm basis for a long overdue revision of our policies and practices in this most important area of domestic and foreign human relations."

Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California, stated: "This President of the United States has urgently called upon this Congress to implement long overdue and sorely needed changes in our immigration laws."

"I would like to strongly urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this new and far-reaching immigration proposal of the President's."

Congressman WILLIAM F. RYAN, of New York, said: "I believe that President Kennedy's proposals represent a giant step forward in the creation of a sensible and humane immigration policy."

Newspaper editorials reflected a similar, nonpartisan approach to the projected revisions. The Chicago Tribune commented:

"The idea of shifting the basis of immigrants' admission from the arbitrary one of country of origin to the rational and humane ones of occupational skills and reuniting families deserves approval."

"The policy of action without regard to race, religion, or country of origin has increasing appeal and scope in the United States, especially in the processes of government. The immigration quotas have been the principal exception in Federal practice to equality before the law for people whatever the circumstances of their birth. It is an exception that it is well to reconsider."

The Denver Post approvingly said of the proposed changes: "It would replace a system based on racial and national discrimination with one having two worthwhile and humane objectives: to assure the United States of a continuing flow of usefully skilled new citizens, and to reunite the families of U.S. citizens."

The Washington Post, July 24, 1963, called President Kennedy's proposal "the best immigration law within living memory to bear a White House endorsement."

The New York Times, July 25, 1963, in its lead editorial stated: "Adoption of the President's wise recommendations would be an act of justice and wisdom, as well as evidence that we fully understand the true nature of the changed world—now grown so small—in which all humanity lives."

The St. Paul Pioneer Press editorialized on July 26, 1963: "Possibly the only negative feature of the administration's new immigration plan is the 5 years it proposes to take in implementing it. The present system is so archaic and inflexible as to deserve speedier abandonment."

"It is time to lay aside the thinking of the twenties in favor of the realities of the sixties with regard to our unreasonable quota system on immigration," wrote the Chattanooga Times. It continued:

"The system of national quotas has long been recognized as a paradox, in a nation proud of its pattern of growth and development based in large part on the openness of its shores to people seeking an opportunity in the land of opportunity."

"The quota system was set up in the immigration law of 1924. Many of its supporters saw this as a means of checking an Asian immigration invasion. But others

adapted it to meet their own desires to limit the number who could come to this country from southern Europe."

"We are a big nation with room—and a continuing need—to grow stronger. We can do this with the skill and ability of our native born and of those from other lands who wish to be a part of this great Nation and to work with us in trying to fulfill its ideals."

"This time to worry about immigration is when people stop wanting to come to this country."

"Seventy-two leading religious, civic, labor, and social service agencies, members of the American Immigration and Citizenship Conference, jointly commended the President as follows:

"We wish to endorse strongly the historic step you have taken in your message of July 23 in calling for the elimination of the national origins quota system."

"We have long urged the removal of this discriminatory aspect of our American immigration policy."

"We are greatly encouraged and wish to express our appreciation for the outstanding leadership you are giving in this major field of human rights."

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I should like to read a short paragraph contained in the introduction to this book. It reads as follows:

On his sentimental visit to Ireland in June of 1963, he stood at the spot from which Patrick Kennedy embarked, and said: "When my great-grandfather left here to become a cooper in East Boston, he carried nothing with him except a strong religious faith and a strong desire for liberty. If he hadn't left, I would be working at the Albatross Co. across the road."

I believe that that is an inspiration for all the immigrants who will come to the United States in the future. It will enable them to stop working at the Albatross Co. and perhaps become President of the United States.

I should also like to express my appreciation for the role played in this legislation by Attorney General Katzenbach, Assistant Attorney General Norbert Schlei, Mr. Leon Ulman, and Mr. Robert Saloschin, all of the Department of Justice; by Commissioner Raymond Farrell, Mr. James Hennessy, and Mrs. Helen Eckerson of the Immigration and Naturalization Service; by Secretary of State Rusk and Mr. Abba Schwartz of the Department of State; and by Mr. Adam Walinsky, formerly of the Department of Justice.

I yield the floor.

THE 35-65 ALLOCATION FORMULA IN THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL—H.R. 9221

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Mississippi from the bottom of my heart for the great courtesy that he has paid to me in coming to the Senate floor tonight to participate with me in making a brief legislative record in the Senate on the Defense Department appropriation bill which originally was planned to be presented today, but which will be presented tomorrow.

This cooperation of the Senator from Mississippi with the senior Senator from Oregon, and, for that matter, all Senators, is very typical of the Senator from Mississippi. I want the Senator to know that I appreciate it.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that tomorrow the conference report on the Department of Defense appropriation bill, H.R. 9221, will be considered in the Senate.

I thank the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] for his fine cooperation and excellent assistance in bringing about passage in the Appropriations Committee, and in the Senate, of amendment No. 61 to H.R. 9221 which would have restored the language of limitation protecting the so-called 35-65 formula applicable to ship conversion, alteration and repair projects. I am also appreciative of the fine help rendered on this matter by other members of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Not only am I grateful for the staunch support of this program on the Senate side but I am sure I reflect the views of businessmen and citizens of the State of Oregon when I say they were indeed pleased by the inclusion in the Senate version of H.R. 9221 of this most important public-interest provision.

I was very much concerned, therefore, when I observed that the conferees receded from amendment No. 61, thereby dropping the 35-65 provision from the bill which amendment was important to the shipbuilding and ship repair interest of Oregon and Washington, and, therefore, to the economy of those two great States.

By way of preface, I should indicate that I agree completely with the Senator from Mississippi when he pointed out in the Senate on August 25 that the 35-65 amendment would foster surveillance by the Congress over the allocation of funds to be used for this particular type of Navy work. After all, this item involves more than \$840 million in Federal spending for fiscal 1966. Expenditures of that magnitude should be protected by congressional oversight procedures; they should not be relegated to discretionary action on the part of the executive branch. This is a matter which, as the Senator from Mississippi pointed out, should be of special interest to the Congress.

As the Senator from Mississippi also pointed out on August 25, the United States has an excess of shipyard capacity; it is in our national interest to maintain as much of this capacity as possible and it is a fact that during the past 3 years, the 35-65 provision has resulted in no serious defense problems for the Navy.

According to the Navy's preliminary plan, the private shipyards will be allocated only 26.3 percent of the more than \$840 million to be devoted to conversion, alteration and repair work during fiscal 1966. This causes me deep concern, because I feel that such a percentage reduction in this work to our private shipyards will jeopardize the economic status of such yards as well as their readiness to meet any national emergency that might occur in the ship conversion, alteration or repair field.

It is my hope that tomorrow, during the course of the Senate discussion of the Conference Report, the Senator from Mississippi will supply his observations, as a matter of legislative history on this

23612

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 20, 1965

conference report. As I pointed out in the statement I submitted to the Senate Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations on July 26:

"If the Navy is given complete discretion to deal or not to deal with the private ship repair yards in this field of Government work, a vital segment of our free enterprise economy will disappear from the scene or will be seriously damaged. We, as a nation, cannot afford to lose this segment of our free economy, nor can we afford to have it weakened."

In fact, I think the dropping of the 35-65 percent amendment is another step in the direction of a military takeover of our free economy. More and more we are seeing our free economy changed into a defense economy controlled by military considerations. Such a trend will lead more and more to our economy being controlled by the Pentagon Building.

Last month, I received a very interesting report, dated August 5, addressed to me by the Acting Chief of the Bureau of Ships. This report supplied figures concerning the total volume of repair and alteration work for fiscal 1963 through 1965, inclusive, which had been assigned to the 13th Naval District, which includes Oregon. Here are the figures:

Year:	
1963	\$9,332,518
1964	6,370,525
1965	6,989,355

However, the August 5 report continued: "It is currently estimated that during fiscal year 1966, Oregon will be invited to bid on repair and alteration work having an aggregate dollar value of \$1,600,000."

Compared with the figure of \$6,989,355, does anyone in the Senate have any surprise that the Senator from Oregon is on his feet in this body tonight, raising serious questions about this terrific cutback from, in round figures, \$7 million in 1965 to \$1,600,000 in 1966?

I say most respectfully that the business interests of my State, not only the shipbuilding and repair interests, but the business interests of my State in all facets of our economy, are greatly concerned about this report from the Navy.

As the Senator from Mississippi can appreciate, this involves a serious drop in the amount of work which we can expect in the Pacific Northwest in the ship repair, conversion, and alteration program for fiscal 1966. The Bureau of Ships softened the blow by stating:

"It is possible that these yards may be invited to bid on additional Navy ship work during fiscal 1966 because of changing operational requirements or other factors."

I am not interested in carrots on a stick. I dislike to think that the right of private enterprise in my State will be dependent, for example, upon such language as "or other factors," which may involve acceleration and escalation of military combat in Asia. As the Senator well knows, no businessman could plan his program and retain his work force on the basis of a vague promise of this type.

If the Senator from Mississippi were in my position, I am sure that he, too, would be deeply concerned over a proposed drop in estimated repair and alteration work for the 13th Naval Dis-

trict. I must necessarily warn the business interests and labor interests of my State that the Johnson administration is permitting the Navy to strike this serious blow to the free enterprise economy of Oregon. If necessary to check the military attack on our free enterprise economy, I must urge the people of my State and the Nation to resort to the ballot box. It is their only effective answer to economic dictatorship by the American military.

In view of this potential and probable adverse effect on the economy of my State, I would like to have the Senator from Mississippi make a record tomorrow on whether or not the Subcommittee on Defense Department Appropriations plans to undertake surveillance activities with respect to the allocation of ship repair, conversion and alteration work by the private and public shipyards during the current fiscal year.

I am sure the Senator from Mississippi understands why I am raising this question, for his comment.

It is my hope that the subcommittee will undertake close continuing review of the allocation of this type of work to the private yards within the 13th Naval District for this fiscal year, and thereafter. After all, our private yards are a bulwark of defense in time of national emergency and it is extremely important that these yards, which can perform outstanding work and at costs less than those of the Government yards, be given an adequate share of work comparable to the 35-percent allocation that has prevailed for the past 3 years. Unless this allocation is maintained, at least in substance, we are in great danger of losing managerial and employee skills in our private shipyards of the Pacific Northwest. These skills are of great importance to our Nation in the era of defense alert in which we now live.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report dated August 5 addressed to me by Rear Admiral Curtze, Acting Chief of the Bureau of Ships, be included in the Record at this point in my remarks. It contains the proof of the Navy's plan to do irreparable damage to the private shipyards of the Pacific Northwest and to the private enterprise economy of the States of Oregon and Washington. The people of Oregon and Washington should not forget this Navy attack on their economy and they should strike back with their political power.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF SHIPS,
Washington, D.C., August 5, 1965.
The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is in further reply to your letter of July 17, 1965, concerning the amount of Navy ship repair, conversion, and alteration work scheduled for the State of Oregon for fiscal years 1966, 1965, 1964, and 1963. You will recall that in my letter of July 23, 1965, I promised to advise you as to the total dollar volume of repair and alteration work on which Oregon yards were invited to bid during the years under review.

Listed below are the figures you requested for the total dollar volume of repair and alteration work during fiscal years 1963 to 1965 on which Oregon yards were invited to bid, as reported by the industrial manager, 13th Naval District:

Year:	
1963	\$9,332,518
1964	6,370,525
1965	6,989,355

It is currently estimated that during fiscal year 1966 Oregon yards will be invited to bid on repair and alteration work having an aggregate dollar value of \$1,600,000. In addition, you will be interested to know that on June 23, 1965, modification and repair of the U.S.S. General H. Arnold (T-ACM-9) was awarded to Northwest Marine Iron Works, Portland, Ore., at a contract price of \$595,311. This work is expected to begin later this month.

It is the Navy's policy, to the extent practicable, to have active fleet ships overhauled at or near their homeports, in order to facilitate reunions of members of the ships' forces with their families, after extended tours of sea duty. Portland is not a homeport for Pacific Fleet ships. However, the Navy will keep in mind the need and capabilities of Portland area yards for Navy shipwork. It is possible that these yards may be invited to bid on additional Navy shipwork during fiscal 1966 because of changing operational requirements or other factors.

I trust that the foregoing information will be adequate for your needs. However, should you desire additional data, please do not hesitate to communicate with me again.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES A. CURTZE,
Rear Admiral, USN, Acting Chief of Bureau.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I serve clear notice tonight that I shall be in the Pacific Northwest in 1966, urging the voters to strike back against an administration which is guilty of doing this great damage to our private economy, unless the administration takes necessary steps to right the wrong that Admiral Curtze seems bent on doing to the economy of my section of the country.

I hope the Senator from Mississippi will fully understand that, as the senior Senator from Oregon, with my trust and responsibilities to represent the people in my area, I raise these questions tonight. I do not ask him to agree with any of my political views—I never do—but I would appreciate any assistance that he can give to my State by way of making legislative history tonight or tomorrow as to whether his committee intends to maintain careful surveillance over the Navy Department and its Bureau of Ships, to see to it that they do not resort to what I fear will be very arbitrary discretion which will be applied by them, as indicated by Admiral Curtze in his letter to me.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me for a brief response at this time, I believe that the Senator from Oregon has made a splendid statement, a very fair one—and penetrating, as is always true in his remarks, going to the very substance of the grave problem we have in the bill and the Senate version of the bill.

I was the author of the amendment providing for a 65-35 percent division of Naval money in the bill for ship alteration and repair—the division between

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1924) to amend section 39(b) of the Bankruptcy Act so as to prohibit a part-time referee from acting as trustee or receiver in any proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "b"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last sentence of paragraph b of section 39 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 67b) is amended to read as follows:

"Active part-time referees, and referees receiving benefits under paragraph (1) of subdivision d of section 40 of this Act, shall not practice as counsel or attorney or act as trustee or receiver in any proceeding under this Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to amend section 39b of the Bankruptcy Act so as to prohibit a part-time referee from acting as trustee or receiver in any proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act.

STATEMENT

The bill was introduced at the request of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

The bill is recommended by the Department of Justice.

In its favorable report on the bill the Department of Justice pointed out:

"A referee in bankruptcy has the responsibility of determining the disposition to be made of property whereas a trustee or receiver acts in a fiduciary capacity to receive, collect, and preserve property and funds. The bill would prevent referees from acting as trustees or receivers in bankruptcy proceedings. As a matter of ethics, policy, and good practice, and to avoid a conflict of interest a referee should not be appointed a trustee or receiver."

The committee believes that the bill is meritorious and recommends it favorably.

GABRIEL A. NAHAS AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 405) for the relief of Gabriel A. Nahas, Vera Nahas, Albert Gabriel Nahas, and Frederika-Maria Nehas, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the periods of time Gabriel A. Nahas and Vera Nahas have resided in the United States since their lawful admission for permanent residence on March 2, 1960, shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Gabriel A. Nahas and Vera Nahas."

No. 172—2

EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to enable the beneficiaries, who were lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on March 2, 1960, to file petitions for naturalization. The bill has been amended in accordance with established precedents. The names of the minor children were deleted in accordance with the suggestion of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, inasmuch as they will derive U.S. citizenship after their parents are naturalized.

YASUO TSUKIKAWA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2039) for the relief of Yasuo Tsukikawa which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 7, after the word "of", to strike out "Yasuo Tsukikawa" and insert "Ken Allen Keene (Yasuo Tsukikawa)"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 205(c), relating to the number of petitions which may be approved in behalf of eligible orphans, shall be inapplicable in the case of a petition filed in behalf of Ken Allen Keene (Yasuo Tsukikawa) by Mr. and Mrs. C. D. Keene, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Ken Allen Keene (Yasuo Tsukikawa)."

EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to facilitate the entry into the United States in a nonquota status of an eligible orphan adopted by citizens of the United States, by waiving the limitation of two orphan petitions.

TO RENDER IMMUNE FROM LEGAL PROCESSES CERTAIN SIGNIFICANT IMPORTED CULTURAL OBJECTS

The bill (S. 2273) to render immune from seizure under judicial process certain objects of cultural significance imported into the United States for temporary display or exhibition, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) whenever any work of art or other object of cultural significance is imported into the United States from any foreign country, pursuant to an agreement entered into between the foreign owner or custodian thereof and the United States or one or more cultural or educational institutions within the United States providing for the temporary exhibition or display thereof within the United States at any cultural exhibition, assembly, activity, or festival administered, operated,

or sponsored, without profit, by any such cultural or educational institution, no court of the United States, any State, the District of Columbia, or any territory or possession of the United States may issue or enforce any judicial process, or enter any judgment, decree, or order, for the purpose or having the effect of depriving such institution, or any carrier engaged in transporting such work or object within the United States, of custody or control of such object if before the importation of such object the President or his designee has determined that such object is of cultural significance and that the temporary exhibition or display thereof within the United States is in the national interest, and a notice to that effect has been published in the Federal Register.

(b) If in any judicial proceeding in any such court any such process, judgment, decree, or order is sought, issued, or entered, the United States attorney for the judicial district within which such proceeding is pending shall be entitled as of right to intervene as a party to that proceeding, and upon request made by either the institution adversely affected, or upon direction by the Attorney General if the United States is adversely affected, shall apply to such court for the denial, quashing, or vacating thereof.

(c) Nothing contained in this Act shall preclude (1) any judicial action for or in aid of the enforcement of the terms of any such agreement or the enforcement of the obligation of any carrier under any contract for the transportation of any such object of cultural significance; or (2) the institution or prosecution by or on behalf of any such institution or the United States of any action for or in aid of the fulfillment of any obligation assumed by such institution or the United States pursuant to any such agreement.

EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to provide a process to render immune from seizure under judicial process certain objects of cultural significance imported into the United States for temporary display or exhibition, and to provide machinery to achieve this objective.

STATEMENT

This proposed legislation will permit organizations and institutions engaged in non-profit activities to import, on a temporary basis, works of art and objects of cultural significance from foreign countries for exhibit and display, without the risk of the seizure or attachment of the said objects by judicial process.

Both the Departments of State and Justice urge favorable consideration of the bill.

As pointed out in the report of the Department of State in its report on S. 2273—

"The bill is consistent with the Department's policy to assist and encourage educational and cultural interchange. Its enactment would be a significant step in international cooperation in this year which has been proclaimed by the President as International Cooperation Year.

The Department of State is informed that both the Smithsonian Institution and the American Association of Museums support this legislation."

The Department of Justice, in its communication, states:

"The commendable objective of this legislation is to encourage the exhibition in the United States of objects of cultural significance which, in the absence of assurances such as are contained in the legislation, would not be made available."

The bill requires that the President of the United States or his designee, make a determination that the objects sought to be im-

ported for exhibition or display are of such cultural significance as to be in the national interest, and publish notice to this effect in the Federal Register. Then, in the event that any judicial proceeding is instituted in any court of the United States, any State, the District of Columbia, or any territory or possession of the United States, the U.S. attorney for the judicial district shall be entitled, as a matter of right, to intervene as a party, and upon request made by either the institution adversely affected, or upon direction by the Attorney General that the United States is adversely affected, shall apply to such court for the denial, quashing, or vacating of such proceeding. Judicial action for or in aid of the enforcement of the terms of any agreement or the enforcement of the obligation of any carrier under any contract for the transportation of any such object of cultural significance is excepted from the immunity and the institution bringing in the objects of art or the United States is authorized to maintain a court action for or in the aid of the fulfillment of any obligation assumed by such institution or the United States pursuant to any such agreement.

The committee is of the opinion that the purposes of this proposed legislation are salutary and will contribute to the educational and cultural development of the people of the United States. It is, therefore, recommended that S. 2273 be favorably considered.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

During the call of the Calendar the following bills were passed over at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 1407, for the relief of Frank E. Lipp.

S. 1898, for the relief of certain aliens.

The following bill was passed over at the request of Mr. DIRKSEN:

H.R. 6726, for the relief of William S. Perrigo.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That concludes the call of the Calendar.

LET US OPEN THE DOOR OF OUR IMMIGRATION POLICY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the enactment of the immigration bill now before the Senate will be a great landmark in the development of the American dream of the freedom and equality of all men. No provision of any national law is more distasteful to millions of Americans than the concept of judging the worth of men and women for immigration on the basis of their place of birth or the nationality of their parents.

I am proud to be a cosponsor in the Senate of the administration immigration bill. This historic legislation should be termed the "Celler immigration bill" in honor of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, EMANUEL CELLER, who more than any other Member of the Congress is responsible for the fact that this legislative proposal is now before the U.S. Senate for debate and vote and will be enacted into law in the near future. Chairman CELLER deserves the gratitude of all Americans for his outstanding leadership in successfully guiding this important legislative proposal through his committee in the face of powerful opposition from those who sought to delay, to undermine and to render ineffective and useless the effort to build a

proper immigration policy. It is a fact that mischiefmakers did to some small degree change the original administration proposal but they failed in their devious purpose to destroy the spirit and intent of this bill. Of course, today those very same obstructionists claim credit for this beneficent legislation.

We are the Nation which chiseled on our beautiful Statue of Liberty:

Give me your tired, your poor,

Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,

The wretched refuse of your teeming shores,
Send them, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me

I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

The only justification that can be made for the national origins quota system is the claim that Americans with English or German or Irish names make better citizens than Americans of Italian, Greek, Polish or Hungarian descent. This concept is utterly false. It contradicts all our traditions and ideals, and makes a mockery of the spirit expressed in the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal.

This bill will make law the fact that each immigrant has a special worth by reason of his potential contribution to our country and he should be judged on his individual ability and worth. Under the proposed bill, people would be admitted on the basis of their skills, education, and training. Another prime governing factor will be the reunification of families now separated by our outmoded immigration laws. It would put an end to painful case histories such as that of the naturalized Greek who is able to bring a maid from Ireland in short order, but who must wait many years to bring his mother or sister from Greece.

As President Franklin D. Roosevelt said in Boston in one of the closing speeches of his final campaign in 1944:

All of our people all over the country—except the pure-blooded Indians—are immigrants or descendants of immigrants, including even those who came over here on the Mayflower.

It was through the open door of its immigration policy that the vast empty space of the United States was peopled during the 19th century. That door was narrowed to a slot when Congress imposed national quotas under the Quota Act of 1921, which stacked the cards in favor of the people of Northern and Western Europe, and to the prejudice of nationals of other areas of the world.

The Celler immigration bill will right the wrong that stains our national conscience and blurs our image as the greatest and best democracy in the entire world. It does not ask of a prospective immigrant, "What country are you from?" but rather, "What can you do for the United States of America?"

This legislative proposal recognizes that each immigrant has a special worth because of his potential contribution to the total manpower of our country. It will eliminate all quotas based on national origin. The total amount of immigrants admitted each year will not be greatly increased.

Mr. President, the enactment of this bill will at long last commit us to a

national policy which will make real the simple truth of the words of St. Paul: "God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the earth."

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour, with a time limitation of 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REQUIREMENT OF PERFORMANCE BONDS RELATING TO CERTAIN CONTRACTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to require that contracts for construction, alteration, or repair of any public building or public work of the District of Columbia be accompanied by a performance bond protecting the District of Columbia and by an additional bond for the protection of persons furnishing material and labor which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. YARBOROUGH, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

H.R. 2414. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain lands situated in the State of Oregon to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.; (Rept. No. 754).

By Mr. EASTLAND (for Mr. LONG of Missouri), from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1758. A bill to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies; (Rept. No. 755).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2543. A bill for the relief of Dr. Maria Yolanda Rafaela Miranda y Monteagudo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2544. A bill for the relief of Kumari Heilen and Kumari Sonamani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

S. 2545. A bill for the relief of Jose Eleuterio Branco Dias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 457

Mr. ALLOTT submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for

September 17, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23329

other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 458

Mr. THURMOND submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 2580, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). The Chair announces that on today, September 17, 1965, the Vice President signed the enrolled bill (H.R. 8469) to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF DAVID G. BRESS TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, September 21, 1965, at 10:30 a.m., in Room 2228 New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of David G. Bress, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. attorney, for the District of Columbia, for a term of 4 years, vice David C. Acheson.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF FRANK MOREY COFFIN TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE, FIRST CIRCUIT

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, September 24, 1965, at 10:30 a.m., in Room 2228 New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Frank Morey Coffin, of Maine, to be U.S. circuit judge, First Circuit, vice John P. Hartigan, retired.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Edward C. Sweeney, of Illinois, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, for a term of 5 years expiring August 9, 1970.

John W. Mahan, of Montana, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, for a term expiring March 4, 1970, vice Francis Adams Cherry.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Friday, September 24, 1965, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Editorial entitled "Watch on the Potomac," published in the Richmond, Va., News Leader.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY'S ADDRESS TO THE CLASS OF 1965, SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I suppose there are a few former Members of Congress who have had a happier, more constructive and positive relationship with Congress than the present Vice President, HUBERT HUMPHREY. He recently addressed the class of 1965 at Syracuse University. I have a copy of the speech which he delivered at that time.

At a time when Congress is suffering the brickbats of criticism as it rarely has in the past, in spite of its constructive achievements, I believe that this address of the Vice President should be called to the attention of all Senators and the country.

Vice President HUMPHREY points out a series of constructive contributions which Congress makes.

First, he says—and this is something which is overlooked:

Few persons can deal directly with either the President or the Supreme Court. But any person, personally or by mail or phone, can communicate with his elected Representatives in Washington. The Members of the Congress, the people's Representatives, provide a direct link between the National Government, this huge structure that shows no signs of becoming smaller or less complicated.

Mr. President, the Vice President points out further the enormous educational value of serving in Congress. He states:

My teachers have been Presidents and department heads, constituents, press, radio and television, and above all a group of wise and distinguished colleagues in both Houses.

Then he points to the constructive achievement of compromise and of achieving a consensus on the basis of a constructive dialog, and he invites attention to the role of Congress for responsible surveillance of the many de-

partments of Government, what he calls a continuing critical review, constructively critical by the committees and the Houses of Congress.

The Vice President then invites attention to the joy of politics. I do not know of anyone who has participated in the joy of politics to the obvious extent that our distinguished Vice President has.

The Vice President concludes with a fine quotation from Emerson:

It was Emerson who once wrote that Congress is a "standing insurrection." You don't need a revolution here; you have one built in. It is a standing insurrection against the ancient enemies of mankind: war, and poverty, and ignorance, and injustice, and sickness, environmental ugliness, and economic and personal insecurity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS TO THE CLASS OF 1965, SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY, BY HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

WILLIAM PEARSON TOLLEY. We're singularly honored today to have so distinguished a guest. Because students are important at Syracuse University we consult each year with the officers of the senior class and ask them their choice of a commencement speaker. And this morning, ladies and gentlemen, by the unanimous action of the senior class, the Vice President of the United States.

Vice President HUMPHREY. Thank you, thank you, Chancellor Tolley. My thanks to you, Chancellor Tolley, deans of the many schools, colleges of this great university, members of the board of trustees, my colleagues in Government who share this platform with me today, Secretary Connor, a graduate of this splendid university, and Secretary Harlan Cleveland, a former professor and head of the Maxwell School of this great university, Congressman HANLEY, the graduates of this class of 1965, the parents who are here in pride and honor, and my fellow Americans, and guests; this is, as I've been reminded once again, as you have, the 111th commencement ceremony, not for me but for this great university. I was saying to Chancellor Tolley how difficult it is these days to be the commencement speaker and try to find a topic that is worthy of the attention and the thoughtful consideration of the graduates. I suppose I should be concerned about the faculty, but in this instance I address myself primarily to the graduates.

The honor that you have done to me today is one that is deeply appreciated, particularly in light of the announcement that has just been made as to how I was selected. I'm especially delighted that the chancellor and the board of trustees extended their invitation to me as a result of the vote of the senior class. You see, I've always been friendly to votes. And I'm particularly pleased when the votes and the voters are friendly to me. And what a refreshing experience, and what a way to renew the spirit of a public official, to be selected once again by votes. I might say to my friends of the graduating class, I have been on both ends of the voting spectrum, and the best end is the winning one. Now I, of course, have no way of knowing against whom I was running in this contest. But I trust that it was some worthy Republican, of which this State has all too many. I hope that I didn't inspire any fear or trepidation in the heart of the Congressman.

I do want to take just for this moment the opportunity to express, a little bit prematurely, but this is one way of assuring that the ceremony comes off, my thanks for the honor that will be bestowed upon several of us here today, the honorary degrees. Now having made the announcement, there is no way that anything can go wrong.

My presence here today is particularly satisfying to me because this year marks the 40th anniversary of the founding of the Maxwell School. Syracuse University has made many contributions to scholarship and to professional excellence in a wide variety of fields. I know that this great university encompasses most all of the disciplines of intellectual life. I'm well aware of the achievements and the high standards of your college of engineering, and I well recall that only last year the President of the United States was with you on the occasion of the dedication of your new communications building. I know the outstanding endeavors of this university in the field of social work and social welfare. These are but a few of your achievements in the field of scholarship and professional excellence.

But as one who has by purpose and design devoted his life to the public service, I want to express my personal thanks and gratitude of the U.S. Government for the work of the Maxwell School. Yes, I've mentioned already the Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, a distinguished former dean of the Maxwell School, Harlan Cleveland, who serves his country well and faithfully and with brilliance, and the graduate of this great university, the Secretary of Commerce, who has brought new life to that Department and a new sense of purpose and direction. In addition to the outstanding contributions of the Maxwell School to social science scholarship and the upgrading of public service, its undergraduate course in public affairs and citizenship is world famous. And I would recommend it to every great university in our land. Your chancellor has told me that more than 20,000 Syracuse undergraduates have taken this course over the past generation. Think of it, 20,000 citizens who have been educated in their continuing personal responsibilities for the preservation and the extension of human freedom—and if ever there was a time that this Nation needed men and women who understand their personal responsibilities to the cause of freedom and social justice, it is now.

Our Nation, as never before, bears the mantle of leadership, and that mantle is not a luxury, but rather a responsibility, a burden and a duty. All the more reason then that citizens, not just the leaders, but citizens all be educated in their continuing personal responsibilities for the stewardship of human freedom. It is difficult to think of a more fundamental contribution which a university can make to free society. So my congratulations to this school. I know that it will continue to flourish and accomplish much in the years ahead.

Now, I am also a refugee from the classroom, a former university teacher. Because of the precarious nature of elective life, I like to mention this in the presence of trustees and deans of faculty. And I would care not to be judged entirely on the singular performance of today, but rather on a longer exposition by the applicant at a later time.

I am well aware, as a former teacher, of the pitfalls of commencement speeches. It's so easy to follow the timeworn formula, the world is in a mess (when wasn't it, by the way?), the older generation has failed (it generally has), and it's up to you of the graduating class to put things right, at least for a day or two. And then someday you'll be the older generation and you too can have the dubious honors that other commencement speakers would heap upon you. But platitudes rarely change attitudes. And baneful criticism and vapid exhortations are

cheap substitutes for hard thought and analysis. I prefer, therefore, to take my stand on the proposition that the American people working through democratic institutions, changing institutions, have met, are meeting, and will continue to meet the most complex problems of our age. If we still have a long way to go, and we have in achieving human equality, in securing international and domestic tranquility, in extending the benefits of our technical genius to all citizens in the American Republic and to all of mankind, let us at least glory in and be inspired by the magnitude of the unfinished agenda. Let us glory in the fact that we still possess the wit and the wisdom to continue making our American democratic system responsive to the terribly difficult and complex problems of this turbulent and rapidly changing age.

Winston Churchill once was reported to have said that democracy is the worst form of government, except all others. And I suppose there is more truth than humor in that analysis of the social structure. But it is our democracy that we mold and design to our purpose. And the glory of the democracy and of the democratic faith is the courage of it, the experimentation of it, and the willingness to try to begin anew, if we should fail, to rise once again, if we should falter, to try once again, remembering with the prophet that the longest journey is the first step, and the first steps toward freedom we have taken, and further steps we will take.

I want to discuss with this graduating class the importance of one of the great constitutional instruments at the disposal of the American people in the business of making this democracy work. I want to discuss with you an institution that is frequently referred to with cynicism, all too often, may I say, by the media, and all too often held in disrepute by people who know all too little about it. I refer to the institution of the Congress of the United States. What I have to say I think needs saying, because too many of our citizens take an indifferent, cynical and even hostile view toward the legislative branch. No one branch has a monopoly on wisdom or virtue, but surely each can make a contribution to the common good. This is not, when I speak of the Congress, to underestimate the need for strong and able presidential leadership, or for wise and humane judicial decisions. It is, however, once again to reaffirm the vital role of representative government, the vital role of the Congress in our constitutional system. Few persons can deal directly with either the President or the Supreme Court. But any person, personally or by mail or phone, can communicate with his elected representatives in Washington. The Members of the Congress, the people's representatives, provide a direct link between the National Government, this huge structure that shows no signs of becoming smaller or less complicated, this huge structure and the almost 195 million persons who comprise this Republic, and a growing population it is. Surely, this contact, this connection, is vital in keeping our National Government responsive to the needs and opinions of the American people.

I have found congressional service to be a remarkable form of higher education. It's a super graduate school in every discipline. My teachers have been Presidents and department heads, constituents, press, radio, and television, and above all a group of wise and distinguished colleagues in both Houses. I cannot in the few minutes that I have convey to you all that I have learned from these teachers, but it is a rich and rewarding experience.

Perhaps I can suggest some lessons in democratic theory and practice which I've gained from my collegial experiences in the Congress. The first lesson has to do with the creative and constructive dimension to the process of compromise—compromise without

the loss of principle or honor. There are 100 Members of the U.S. Senate and 435 Members of the House. They come from States and districts as diverse as Nevada and New York, Alaska and Alabama. No two States or regions of the United States have identical needs, backgrounds, interests, or even prejudices. And one of the jobs of the Congress is to reconcile such differences through the process of compromise and accommodation. What sometimes seem to the naive and untutored eye to be legislative obstructionisms, often are no more than the honest expressions of dedicated representatives trying to make clear the attitudes and the interests of their States and regions, sometimes trying to gain time for public understanding of vital issues. As Sir Richard Grenfell once observed: "Mankind is slowly learning that because two men differ neither need be wicked."

From the earliest days of this Republic—at the Constitutional Convention—the leaders of this Nation have maintained an unswerving commitment to moderation. Now, if our Founding Fathers had not understood the need to overcome extremes in drafting our Constitution, this noble experiment of ours in the art of self-government would surely have foundered years ago on the rocks of dissension and discord.

As in the deliberations of the Constitutional Convention, the heart of congressional activity are skills of negotiation, of honest bargaining among equals. My willingness to compromise, and I have done so more times than I can count, is the respect that I pay to the dignity of those with whom I disagree. Yes, I have come to the conclusion that possibly all of my original suggestions may not have been right. There may be others, you know, who have solid and constructive views. Dogma and doctrine have little place in a society in which there is respect for the attitude and the opinion of others.

Through reasonable discussion, through taking into account the view of many, Congress amends and refines the legislative proposals so that once a law is passed it reflects the collective judgment of a diverse people. This is consensus, the word that is used so much in these days. Consensus is nothing but agreement, obtained by a constructive dialog between persons of different points of view, based upon mutual respect and understanding. Surely this is a remarkable service for a people that aspire to orderly progress. Surely the habits of accommodation and compromise are of universal consequence. These are the very skills and attitudes so desperately needed on the larger stage of world conflict, and possibly our difficulties on that world stage can be better understood when we recognize that where there are despotic forms of government or dictatorships, the art of negotiation and compromise has been sacrificed to power, to arrogance, and to the strong will of the man who knows he is right. We possibly have some teaching to do before the processes of peace may reach a maturity and an achievement.

World order and the rule of law will be secure on this earth only when men have learned to cope with the continuing conflicts of peoples and nations through the peaceful processes of bargaining and negotiation. And might I admonish my fellow Americans that we too need to be cognizant of the differences in other lands, that we seek no pax Americana, we seek no trademark "Made in the U.S.A." we seek above all to negotiate, to accommodate, to adjust so that peoples realize their hopes in their way.

A second lesson that I have learned from my congressional teachers is the importance of the congressional role of responsible surveillance. There are roughly 70 separate departments and agencies in the Federal Government. Now if you should notice two

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to authorize the Secretary of the Senate, in the engrossment of the bill, to make any necessary technical corrections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the legislation which has just been enacted, will enhance the recreational and scenic values of the highways of America. This legislation was not only desired but was necessary. Senators responded with a vote of 63 to 14 for the bill, which indicates the overwhelming support of membership of the Senate for the President's beautification program. The Committee on Public Works and the Senate have worked effectively to preserve and develop the esthetic values of the American scene, while also protecting the rights of private property and keeping damage to individual businesses at an absolute.

I express my personal and official appreciation to Richard Royce, professional staff member of the Public Works Committee who has given such diligent and dedicated attention to this legislation from its inception. I could not have had a more capable member of any committee staff standing at my side than Dick Royce.

I also wish to thank Ron Linton, who is the Chief Clerk of the Committee on Public Works.

I also wish to add my thanks for the great work which was done by Bob Perrin, the administrative assistant to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA].

Also, let me thank my executive assistant, Jim Harris, for his capable and diligent labors in connection with the bill.

I thank all members of the staff of the Committee on Public Works, who contributed their valuable services during consideration and preparation of the measure.

I also express my appreciation to all members of the Subcommittee on Public Works. It is difficult to name Senators individually, because members of this subcommittee gave earnest attention to the subject, even though they were concerned with other committees dealing with education, labor, and agriculture, which made it very difficult at times to give the painstaking effort which was required in the preparation of this legislation.

In connection with all the members of the subcommittee who assisted me, it is entirely appropriate that I speak especially of the efforts of the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], who, in committee and on the floor of the Senate has been of constant and valued support. Other Senators who joined in presenting the points which they felt

were most important to be stressed in the passage of this measure have been of great assistance.

I also thank the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee and the full committee, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. Even though we were in disagreement on many issues in connection with this legislation, it was a privilege to work with him, as always, because he is very careful in his attention to the details of any bill, and he is uniformly courteous. I am grateful for the cooperation he gave to the consideration of this legislation, including the administration's amendments which I have offered.

I also thank the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], for their unfailing courtesies and assistance to me during the consideration of this legislation.

Mr. President, it is my hope that the House of Representatives will promptly consider this legislation. I believe that any differences between the House version, which I hope will pass very soon, and the Senate version, which has now passed, can be resolved, and that an effective instrumentality, which I believe we have drafted, can be sent to the President of the United States, who will, we know, quickly sign the measure into law.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. Without desiring to prolong unduly the session this evening, I believe it should be stated that as one member of the subcommittee, in my judgment—and I am sure in the judgment of the rest of the subcommittee—the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], in handling this bill on the floor of the Senate, has accepted and survived with great credit one of the more difficult and frustrating assignments which I have seen assumed by any Senator in that capacity in some time. So he has to add to his credit not only the outstanding work which he performed in the committee, but also the great patience and wisdom which he has shown on the floor of the Senate, to say nothing of his fortitude in handling this difficult assignment.

I should like to add my personal commendation to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am grateful to the Senator from Maine for his kind comments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Federal aid highway system has been a boon to individual States and to the Nation as a whole. Indeed, few governmental programs have been more successful. Today, after long, hard work, we have crowned that success with a vital new dimension, a bill to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal aid highway systems.

It is evident that passage of the bill would not have been accomplished without the devoted effort and the coopera-

tion of a number of Members of this body. Special congratulations must be extended to the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who so skillfully managed this bill. No one has doubted his expertise on matters involving this country's highway system. But, in addition, he has, by the capable management of this bill, demonstrated not only his appreciation for the existent as well as the potential beauty surrounding our highways but also his legislative management abilities. I commend the Senator from West Virginia for this demonstration of his parliamentary skill in the management of this bill.

It is abundantly clear that provision for scenic development and road beautification has not been a partisan affair. I can think of no one who has worked more assiduously and purposefully toward these goals than the distinguished ranking Republican member of the Senate Committee on Public Works, the able senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. Time and time again on this bill he made notable contributions and suggestions. When he proposed amendments, both in committee and on the floor, other Senators quite appropriately took notice. I extend my personal thanks to him for lending his great talent and expertise to this measure and for his great constructive assistance and cooperation in facilitating the expeditious passage of this bill; my thanks are extended also to the Senate as a whole for the cooperation displayed in considering this bill.

I would be remiss if I did not mention other individuals who have consistently worked toward the goal of passage of a highway beautification bill. I refer especially to the very helpful and capable senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the able chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] who has often sponsored bills concerning road beautification, and to my distinguished colleague, the able junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the distinguished junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the distinguished Senators from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. DIRKSEN], the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the distinguished Senators from Hawaii [Mr. FONG and Mr. INOUE], the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the distinguished Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK], the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORTON], the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and other Members of this body on both sides of the aisle, members and nonmembers of the Committee on Public Works, who have submitted and carefully argued for amendments or otherwise worked purposefully and diligently toward passage of a highway beautification bill.

I certainly feel that Senate passage of this bill is a significant landmark in this Nation's program of highway beautification.

Mr. President, let me take this time to express my deepest thanks to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] for the patience he has shown today, in holding up a very important speech which he had intended to give earlier, in order to allow this bill to pass.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 733, H.R. 2580.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175; 8 U.S.C. 1151) be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 201. (a) Exclusive of special immigrants defined in section 101(a)(27), and of the immediate relatives of United States citizens specified in subsection (b) of this section, the number of aliens who may be issued immigrant visas or who may otherwise acquire the status of an alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, or who may, pursuant to section 203(a)(7) enter conditionally, (i) shall not in any of the first three quarters of any fiscal year exceed a total of 45,000 and (ii) shall not in any fiscal year exceed a total of 170,000.

"(b) The 'immediate relatives' referred to in subsection (a) of this section shall mean the children, spouses, and parents of a citizen of the United States; *Provided*, That in the case of parents, such citizen must be at least twenty-one years of age. The immediate relatives specified in this subsection who are otherwise qualified for admission as immigrants shall be admitted as such, without regard to the numerical limitations in this Act.

"(c) During the period from July 1, 1965, through June 30, 1968, the annual quota of any quota area shall be the same as that which existed for that area on June 30, 1965. The Secretary of State shall, not later than on the sixtieth day immediately following the date of enactment of this subsection and again on or before September 1, 1966, and September 1, 1967, determine and proclaim the amount of quota numbers which remain unused at the end of the fiscal year ending on June 30, 1965, June 30, 1966, and June 30, 1967, respectively, and are available for distribution pursuant to subsection (d) of this section.

"(d) Quota numbers not issued or otherwise used during the previous fiscal year, as determined in accordance with subsection (c) hereof, shall be transferred to an immigration pool. Allocation of numbers from the pool and from national quotas shall not together exceed in any fiscal year the numerical limitations in subsection (a) of this section. The immigration pool shall be made available to immigrants otherwise admissible under the provisions of this Act who are unable to obtain prompt issuance of a preference visa due to oversubscription

of their quotas, or subquotas as determined by the Secretary of State. Visas and conditional entries shall be allocated from the immigration pool within the percentage limitations and in the order of priority specified in section 203 without regard to the quota to which the alien is chargeable.

"(e) The Immigration pool and the quotas of quota areas shall terminate June 30, 1968. Thereafter immigrants admissible under the provisions of this Act who are subject to the numerical limitations of subsection (a) of this section shall be admitted in accordance with the percentage limitations and in the order of priority specified in section 203."

Sec. 2. Section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175; 8 U.S.C. 1152) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) No person shall receive any preference or priority or be discriminated against in the issuance of an immigrant visa because of his race, sex, nationality, place of birth, or place of residence, except as specifically provided in section 101(a)(27), section 201(b), and section 203: *Provided*, That the total number of immigrant visas and the number of conditional entries made available to natives of any single foreign state under paragraphs (1) through (8) of section 203(a) shall not exceed 20,000 in any fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not operate to reduce the number of immigrants who may be admitted under the quota of any quota area before June 30, 1968.

"(b) Each independent country, self-governing dominion, mandated territory, and territory under the international trusteeship system of the United Nations, other than the United States and its outlying possessions shall be treated as a separate foreign state for the purposes of the numerical limitation set forth in the proviso to subsection (a) of this section when approved by the Secretary of State. All other inhabited lands shall be attributed to a foreign state specified by the Secretary of State. For the purposes of this Act the foreign state to which an immigrant is chargeable shall be determined by birth within such foreign state except that (1) an alien child, when accompanied by his alien parent or parents, may be charged to the same foreign state as the accompanying parent or of either accompanying parent if such parent has received or would be qualified for an immigrant visa, if necessary to prevent the separation of the child from the accompanying parent or parents, and if the foreign state to which such parent has been or would be chargeable has not exceeded the numerical limitation set forth in the proviso to subsection (a) of this section for that fiscal year; (2) if an alien is chargeable to a different foreign state from that of his accompanying spouse, the foreign state to which such alien is chargeable may, if necessary to prevent the separation of husband and wife, be determined by the foreign state of the accompanying spouse, if such spouse has received or would be qualified for an immigrant visa and if the foreign state to which such spouse has been or would be chargeable has not exceeded the numerical limitation set forth in the proviso to subsection (a) of this section for that fiscal year; (3) an alien born in the United States shall be considered as having been born in the country of which he is a citizen or subject, or if he is not a citizen or subject of any country then in the last foreign country in which he had his residence as determined by the consular officer; (4) an alien born within any foreign state in which neither of his parents was born and in which neither of his parents had a residence at the time of such alien's birth may be charged to the foreign state of either parent.

"(c) Any immigrant born in a colony or other component or dependent area of a foreign state unless a special immigrant as

provided in section 101(a)(27) or an immediate relative of a United States citizen as specified in section 201(b), shall be chargeable, for the purpose of limitation set forth in section 202(a), to the foreign state, except that the number of persons born in any such colony or other component or dependent area overseas from the foreign state chargeable to the foreign state in any one fiscal year shall not exceed 1 per centum of the maximum number of immigrant visas available to such foreign state.

"(d) In the case of any change in the territorial limits of foreign states, the Secretary of State shall, upon recognition of such change, issue appropriate instructions to all diplomatic and consular offices."

Sec. 3. Section 203 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175; 8 U.S.C. 1153) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 203. (a) Aliens who are subject to the numerical limitations specified in section 201(a) shall be allotted visas or their conditional entry authorized, as the case may be, as follows:

"(1) Visas shall be first made available, in a number not to exceed 20 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a)(ii), to qualified immigrants who are the unmarried sons or daughters of citizens of the United States.

"(2) Visas shall next be made available, in a number not to exceed 20 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a)(ii), plus any visas not required for the classes specified in paragraph (1), to qualified immigrants who are the spouses, unmarried sons or unmarried daughters of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

"(3) Visas shall next be made available, in a number not to exceed 10 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a)(ii), to qualified immigrants who are members of the professions, or who because of their exceptional ability in the sciences or the arts will substantially benefit prospectively the national economy, cultural interests, or welfare of the United States.

"(4) Visas shall next be made available, in a number not to exceed 10 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a)(ii), plus any visas not required for the classes specified in paragraphs (1) through (3), to qualified immigrants who are the married sons or the married daughters of citizens of the United States.

"(5) Visas shall next be made available, in a number not to exceed 24 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a)(ii), plus any visas not required for the classes specified in paragraphs (1) through (4), to qualified immigrants who are the brothers or sisters of citizens of the United States.

"(6) Visas shall next be made available, in a number not to exceed 10 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a)(ii), to qualified immigrants who are capable of performing specified skilled or unskilled labor, not of a temporary or seasonal nature, for which a shortage of employable and willing persons exists in the United States.

"(7) Conditional entries shall next be made available by the Attorney General, pursuant to such regulations as he may prescribe and in a number not to exceed 6 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a)(ii), to aliens who satisfy an Immigration and Naturalization Service officer at an examination in any non-Communist or non-Communist-dominated country, (A) that (i) because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion they have fled (I) from any Communist or Communist-dominated country or area, or (II) from any country within the general area of the Middle East, and (ii) are unable or unwilling to return to such country or area on account of race, religion, or political opinion, and (iii) are not nation-

als of the countries or areas in which their application for conditional entry is made; or (B) that they are persons uprooted by catastrophic natural calamity as defined by the President who are unable to return to their usual place of abode. For the purpose of the foregoing the term "general area of the Middle East" means the area between and including (1) Libya on the west, (2) Turkey on the north, (3) Pakistan on the east, and (4) Saudi Arabia and Ethiopia on the south: *Provided*, That immigrant visas in a number not exceeding one-half the number specified in this paragraph may be made available, in lieu of conditional entries of a like number, to such aliens who have been continuously physically present in the United States for a period of at least two years prior to application for adjustment of status.

"(8) Visas authorized in any fiscal year, less those required for issuance to the classes specified in paragraphs (1) through (6) and less the number of conditional entries and visas made available pursuant to paragraph (7), shall be made available to other qualified immigrants strictly in the chronological order in which they qualify. Waiting lists of applicants shall be maintained in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State. No immigrant visa shall be issued to a nonpreference immigrant under this paragraph, or to an immigrant with a preference under paragraph (3) or (6) of this subsection, until the consular officer is in receipt of a determination made by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a)(14).

"(9) A spouse or child as defined in section 101(b)(1) (A), (B), (C), (D), or (E) shall, if not otherwise entitled to an immigrant status and the immediate issuance of a visa or to conditional entry under paragraphs (1) through (8), be entitled to the same status, and the same order of consideration provided in subsection (b), if accompanying, or following to join, his spouse or parent.

"(b) In considering applications for immigrant visas under subsection (a) consideration shall be given to applicants in the order in which the classes of which they are members are listed in subsection (a).

"(c) Immigrant visas issued pursuant to paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (a) shall be issued to eligible immigrants in the order in which a petition in behalf of each such immigrant is filed with the Attorney General as provided in section 204.

"(d) Every immigrant shall be presumed to be a nonpreference immigrant until he establishes to the satisfaction of the consular officer and the immigration officer that he is entitled to a preference status under paragraphs (1) through (7) of subsection (a), or to a special immigrant status under section 101(a)(27), or that he is an immediate relative of a United States citizen as specified in section 201(b). In the case of any alien claiming in his application for an immigrant visa to be an immediate relative of a United States citizen as specified in section 201(b) or to be entitled to preference immigrant status under paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (a), the consular officer shall not grant such status until he has been authorized to do so as provided by section 204.

"(e) For the purposes of carrying out his responsibilities in the orderly administration of this section, the Secretary of State is authorized to make reasonable estimates of the anticipated numbers of visas to be issued during any quarter of any fiscal year within each of the categories of subsection (a), and to rely upon such estimates in authorizing the issuance of such visas. The Secretary of State, in his discretion, may terminate the registration on a waiting list of any alien who fails to evidence his con-

tinued intention to apply for a visa in such manner as may be, by regulation prescribed.

"(f) The Attorney General shall submit to the Congress a report containing complete and detailed statement of facts in the case of each alien who conditionally entered the United States pursuant to subsection (a)(7) of this section. Such reports shall be submitted on or before January 15 and June 15 of each year.

"(g) Any alien who conditionally entered the United States as a refugee, pursuant to subsection (a)(7) of this section, whose conditional entry has not been terminated by the Attorney General pursuant to such regulations as he may prescribe, who has been in the United States for at least two years, and who has not acquired permanent residence, shall forthwith return or be returned to the custody of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and shall thereupon be inspected and examined for admission into the United States, and his case dealt with in accordance with the provisions of sections 235, 236, and 237 of this Act.

"(h) Any alien who, pursuant to subsection (g) of this section, is found, upon inspection by the immigration officer or after hearing before a special inquiry officer, to be admissible as an immigrant under this Act at the time of his inspection and examination, except for the fact that he was not and is not in possession of the documents required by section 212(a)(20), shall be regarded as lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his arrival."

Sec. 4. Section 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 176; 8 U.S.C. 1154) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 204. (a) Any citizen of the United States claiming that an alien is entitled to a preference status by reason of the relationships described in paragraphs (1), (4), or (5) of section 203(a), or to an immediate relative status under section 201(b), or any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence claiming that an alien is entitled to a preference status by reason of the relationship described in section 203(a)(2), or any alien desiring to be classified as a preference immigrant under section 203(a)(3) (or any person on behalf of such an alien), or any person desiring and intending to employ within the United States an alien entitled to classification as a preference immigrant under section 203(a)(6), may file a petition with the Attorney General for such classification. The petition shall be in such form as the Attorney General may by regulations prescribe and shall contain such information and be supported by such documentary evidence as the Attorney General may require. The petition shall be made under oath administered by any individual having authority to administer oaths, if executed in the United States, but, if executed outside the United States, administered by a consular officer.

"(b) After an investigation of the facts in each case, and after consultation with the Secretary of Labor with respect to petitions to accord a status under section 203(a)(3) or (6), the Attorney General shall, if he determines that the facts stated in the petition are true and that the alien in behalf of whom the petition is made is an immediate relative specified in section 201(b) or is eligible for a preference status under section 203(a), approve the petition and forward one copy thereof to the Department of State. The Secretary of State shall then authorize the consular officer concerned to grant the preference status.

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b) no more than two petitions may be approved for one petitioner in behalf of a child as defined in section 101(b)(1) (E) or (F) unless necessary to prevent the

separation of brothers and sisters and no petition shall be approved if the alien has previously been accorded a nonquota or preference status as the spouse of a citizen of the United States or the spouse of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, by reason of a marriage determined by the Attorney General to have been entered into for the purpose of evading the immigration laws.

"(d) The Attorney General shall forward to the Congress a report on each approved petition for immigrant status under sections 203(a)(3) or 203(a)(6) stating the basis for his approval and such facts as were by him deemed to be pertinent in establishing the beneficiary's qualifications for the preferential status. Such reports shall be submitted to the Congress on the first and fifteenth day of each calendar month in which the Congress is in session.

"(e) Nothing in this section shall be construed to entitle an immigrant, in behalf of whom a petition under this section is approved, to enter the United States as a preference immigrant under section 203(a) or as an immediate relative under section 201(b) if upon his arrival at a port of entry in the United States he is found not to be entitled to such classification."

Sec. 5. Section 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 176; 8 U.S.C. 1155) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 205. The Attorney General may, at any time, for what he deems to be good and sufficient cause, revoke the approval of any petition approved by him under section 204. Such revocation shall be effective as of the date of approval of any such petition. In no case, however, shall such revocation have effect unless there is mailed to the petitioner's last known address a notice of the revocation and unless notice of the revocation is communicated through the Secretary of State to the beneficiary of the petition before such beneficiary commences his journey to the United States. If notice of revocation is not so given, and the beneficiary applies for admission to the United States, his admissibility shall be determined in the manner provided for by sections 235 and 236."

Sec. 6. Section 206 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 181; 8 U.S.C. 1156) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 206. If an immigrant having an immigrant visa is excluded from admission to the United States and deported, or does not apply for admission before the expiration of the validity of his visa, or if an alien having an immigrant visa issued to him as a preference immigrant is found not to be a preference immigrant, an immigrant visa or a preference immigrant visa, as the case may be, may be issued in lieu thereof to another qualified alien."

Sec. 7. Section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 181; 8 U.S.C. 1157) is stricken.

Sec. 8. Section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 166; 8 U.S.C. 1101) is amended as follows:

(a) Paragraph (27) of subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(27) The term 'special immigrant' means—

"(A) an immigrant who was born in any independent foreign country of the Western Hemisphere or in the Canal Zone and the spouse and children of any such immigrant, if accompanying, or following to join him: *Provided*, That no immigrant visa shall be issued pursuant to this clause until the consular officer is in receipt of a determination made by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a)(14);

"(B) an immigrant, lawfully admitted for permanent residence, who is returning from a temporary visit abroad;

"(C) an immigrant who was a citizen of the United States and may, under section

824(a) or 327 of title III, apply for reacquisition of citizenship;

"(D) (1) an immigrant who continuously for at least two years immediately preceding the time of his application for admission to the United States has been, and who seeks to enter the United States solely for the purpose of carrying on the vocation of minister of a religious denomination, and whose services are needed by such religious denomination having a bona fide organization in the United States; and (1) the spouse or the child of any such immigrant, if accompanying or following to join him; or

"(E) an immigrant who is an employee, or an honorably retired former employee, of the United States Government abroad, and who has performed faithful service for a total of fifteen years, or more, and his accompanying spouse and children: *Provided*, That the principal officer of a Foreign Service establishment, in his discretion, shall have recommended the granting of special immigrant status to such alien in exceptional circumstances and the Secretary of State approves such recommendation and finds that it is in the national interest to grant such status."

(b) Paragraph (32) of subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(32) The term 'profession' shall include but not be limited to architects, engineers, lawyers, physicians, surgeons, and teachers in elementary or secondary schools, colleges, academies, or seminaries."

(c) Subparagraph (1)(F) of subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(F) a child, under the age of fourteen at the time a petition is filed in his behalf to accord a classification as an immediate relative under section 201(b), who is an orphan because of the death or disappearance of, abandonment or desertion by, or separation or loss from, both parents, or for whom the sole or surviving parent is incapable of providing the proper care which will be provided the child if admitted to the United States and who has in writing irrevocably released the child for emigration and adoption; who has been adopted abroad by a United States citizen and his spouse who personally saw and observed the child prior to or during the adoption proceedings; or who is coming to the United States for adoption by a United States citizen and spouse who have complied with the preadoption requirements, if any, of the child's proposed residence: *Provided*, That no natural parent or prior adoptive parent of any such child shall thereafter, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under this Act."

Sec. 9. Section 211 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 181; 8 U.S.C. 1181) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 211. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) no immigrant shall be admitted into the United States unless at the time of application for admission he (1) has a valid unexpired immigrant visa or was born subsequent to the issuance of such visa of the accompanying parent, and (2) presents a valid unexpired passport or other suitable travel document, or document of identity and nationality, if such document is required under the regulations issued by the Attorney General. With respect to immigrants to be admitted under quotas of quota areas prior to June 30, 1968, no immigrant visa shall be deemed valid unless the immigrant is properly chargeable to the quota area under the quota of which the visa is issued.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212(a)(20) of this Act in such cases or in such classes of cases and under such conditions as may be by regulations prescribed, returning resident immigrants, defined in section 101(a)(27)(B), who are otherwise admissible may be readmitted to the United States by the Attorney General in his discretion without being required to

obtain a passport, immigrant visa, reentry permit or other documentation."

Sec. 10. Section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 182; 8 U.S.C. 1182) is amended as follows:

(a) Paragraph (14) is amended to read as follows:

"Aliens seeking to enter the United States, for the purpose of performing skilled or unskilled labor, unless the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified to the Secretary of State and to the Attorney General that (A) there are not sufficient workers in the United States who are able, willing, qualified, and available at the time of application for a visa and admission to the United States and at the place to which the alien is destined to perform such skilled or unskilled labor, and (B) the employment of such aliens will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of the workers in the United States similarly employed. The exclusion of aliens under this paragraph shall apply to special immigrants defined in section 101 (a) (27) (A) (other than the parents, spouses, or children of United States citizens or of aliens lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence), to preference immigrant aliens described in section 203(a) (3) and (6), and to nonpreference immigrant aliens described in section 203(a)(8);"

(b) Paragraph (20) is amended by deleting the letter "(e)" and substituting therefor the letter "(a)".

(c) Paragraph (21) is amended by deleting the word "quota".

(d) Paragraph (24) is amended by deleting the language within the parentheses and substituting therefor the following: "other than aliens described in section 101(a)(27) (A) and (B)."

Sec. 11. The Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175; 8 U.S.C. 1151) is amended as follows:

(a) Section 221(a) is amended by deleting the words "the particular nonquota category in which the immigrant is classified, if a nonquota immigrant," and substituting in lieu thereof the words "the preference, nonpreference, immediate relative, or special immigration classification to which the alien is charged."

(b) The fourth sentence of subsection 221 (c) is amended by deleting the word "quota" preceding the word "number;" the word "quota" preceding the word "year," and the words "a quota" preceding the word "immigrant," and substituting in lieu thereof the word "an".

(c) Section 222(a) is amended by deleting the words "preference quota or a nonquota immigrant" and substituting in lieu thereof the words "an immediate relative within the meaning of section 201(b) or a preference or special immigrant."

(d) Section 224 is amended to read as follows: "A consular officer may, subject to the limitations provided in section 221, issue an immigrant visa to a special immigrant or immediate relative as such upon satisfactory proof, under regulations prescribed under this Act, that the applicant is entitled to special immigrant or immediate relative status."

(e) Section 241(a)(10) is amended by substituting for the words "Section 101(a)(27)(C)" the words "Section 101(a)(27)(A)".

(f) Section 243(h) is amended by striking out "physical persecution" and inserting in lieu thereof "persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion".

Sec. 12. Section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 214; 8 U.S.C. 1254) is amended as follows:

(a) Subsection (d) is amended to read:

"(d) Upon the cancellation of deportation in the case of any alien under this section, the Attorney General shall record the alien's lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date the cancellation of deportation of such alien is made, and unless

the alien is entitled to a special immigrant classification under section 101(a)(27)(A), or is an immediate relative within the meaning of section 201(b) the Secretary of State shall reduce by one the number of nonpreference immigrant visas authorized to be issued under section 203(a)(8) for the fiscal year then current."

(b) Subsection (f) is amended by deleting "entered the United States as a crewman; or (2)" and by changing "(3)" wherever it appears in said subsection to "(2)".

Sec. 13. Section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 217; 8 U.S.C. 1255) is amended as follows:

(a) Subsection (b) is amended to read:

"(b) Upon the approval of an application for adjustment made under subsection (a), the Attorney General shall record the alien's lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date the order of the Attorney General approving the application for the adjustment of status is made, and the Secretary of State shall reduce by one the number of the preference or nonpreference visas authorized to be issued under section 203(a) within the class to which the alien is chargeable, for the fiscal year then current."

(b) Subsection (c) is amended to read:

"(c) The provisions of this section shall not be applicable to any alien who is a native of any country of the Western Hemisphere or of any adjacent island named in section 101(b)(5), other than any such alien born in an independent foreign country of the Western Hemisphere, who, because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion, is out of his usual place of abode and unable to return thereto."

Sec. 14. Section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 230; 8 U.S.C. 1351) is amended as follows:

(a) Immediately after "Sec. 281." insert "(a)";

(b) Paragraph (6) is amended to read as follows:

"(6) For filing with the Attorney General of each petition under section 204 and section 214(c), \$10; and";

(c) The following is inserted after paragraph (7), and is designated subsection (b):

"(b) The time and manner of payment of the fees specified in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) of this section, including but not limited to partial deposit or prepayment at the time of registration, shall be prescribed by the Secretary of State; and

(d) The paragraph beginning with the words "The fees * * *" is designated subsection (c).

Sec. 15. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 182; 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(1)) is amended by deleting the language "feeble-minded" and inserting the language "mentally retarded" in its place.

(b) Paragraph (4) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 182; 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(4)) is amended by deleting the word "epilepsy" and substituting the words "or sexual deviation".

(c) Sections 212 (f), (g), and (h) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by the Act of September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 654, 655; 8 U.S.C. 1182), are hereby redesignated sections 212 (g), (h), and (i), respectively, and section 212(g) as so redesignated is amended by inserting before the words "afflicted with tuberculosis in any form" the following: "who is excludable from the United States under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section, or any alien" and by adding at the end of such subsection the following sentence: "Any alien excludable under paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of this section because of past history of mental illness who has one of the same family relationships as are prescribed in this subsection for aliens afflicted with tuber-

culosis and whom the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service finds to have been free of such mental illness for a period of time sufficient in the light of such history to demonstrate recovery shall be eligible for a visa in accordance with the terms of this subsection."

Sec. 16. Sections 1, 2, and 11 of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 504-505), as amended by section 6 of the Act of June 28, 1962 (76 Stat. 124), are repealed.

Sec. 17. Section 221(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 192; 8 U.S.C. 1201(g)) is amended by deleting the period at the end thereof and adding the following: "Provided further, That a visa may be issued to an alien defined in section 101(a) (15)(B) or an alien defined in section 101(a) (15)(F), in whose behalf evidence has been submitted that he will be admitted and regularly enrolled as a student at an educational institution within the United States approved by the Attorney General, if such alien is otherwise entitled to receive a visa, upon receipt of a notice by the consular officer from the Attorney General of the giving of a bond with sufficient surety in such sum and containing such conditions as the consular officer shall prescribe, to insure that at the expiration of the time for which such alien has been admitted by the Attorney General, as provided in section 214(a), or upon failure to maintain the status under which he was admitted, or to maintain any status subsequently acquired under section 248 of the Act, such alien will depart from the United States."

Sec. 18. So much of section 272(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 226; 8 U.S.C. 1322(a)) as precedes the words "shall pay to the collector of customs" is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 272. (a) Any person who shall bring to the United States an alien (other than an alien crewman) who is (1) mentally retarded, (2) insane, (3) afflicted with psychopathic personality, or with sexual deviation, (4) a chronic alcoholic, (5) afflicted with any dangerous contagious disease, or (6) a narcotic drug addict,"

Sec. 19. Section 249 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 219; 8 U.S.C. 1259) is amended by striking out "June 28, 1940" in clause (a) of such section and inserting in lieu thereof "June 28, 1958".

Sec. 20. This Act shall become effective on the first day of the first month after the expiration of thirty days following the date of its enactment except as provided herein.

Sec. 21. (a) There is hereby established a Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") to be composed of fifteen members. The President shall appoint the Chairman of the Commission and eight other members thereof. The President of the Senate, with the approval of the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, shall appoint three members from the membership of the Senate. The Speaker of the House of Representatives, with the approval of the majority and minority leaders of the House, shall appoint three members from the membership of the House. A vacancy in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original designation and appointment.

(b) The Commission shall study the following matters:

(1) Prevailing and projected demographic, technological, and economic trends, particularly as they pertain to Western Hemisphere nations;

(2) Present and projected unemployment in the United States, by occupations, industries, geographic areas and other factors, in relation to immigration from the Western Hemisphere;

(3) The interrelationships between immigration, present and future, and existing and

contemplated national and international programs and projects of Western Hemisphere nations, including programs and projects for economic and social development;

(4) The operation of the immigration laws of the United States as they pertain to Western Hemisphere nations, with emphasis on the adequacy of such laws from the standpoint of fairness and from the standpoint of the impact of such laws on employment and working conditions within the United States;

(5) The implications of the foregoing with respect to the security and international relations of Western Hemisphere nations; and

(6) Any other matters which the Commission believes to be germane to the purposes for which it was established.

(c) On or before July 1, 1967, the Commission shall make a first report to the President and the Congress, and on or before January 15, 1968, the Commission shall make a final report to the President and the Congress. Such reports shall include the recommendations of the Commission as to what changes, if any, are needed in the immigration laws in the light of its study. The Commission's recommendations shall include, but shall not be limited to, recommendations as to whether, and if so how, numerical limitations should be imposed upon immigration to the United States from the nations of the Western Hemisphere. In formulating its recommendations on the latter subject, the Commission shall give particular attention to the impact of such immigration on employment and working conditions within the United States and to the necessity of preserving the special relationship of the United States with its sister Republics of the Western Hemisphere.

(d) The life of the Commission shall expire upon the filing of its final report, except that the Commission may continue to function for up to sixty days thereafter for the purpose of winding up its affairs.

(e) Unless legislation inconsistent herewith is enacted on or before June 30, 1968, in response to recommendations of the Commission or otherwise, the number of special immigrants within the meaning of section 101(a) (27) (A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, exclusive of special immigrants who are immediate relatives of United States citizens as described in section 201(b) of that Act, shall not, in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1968, or in any fiscal year thereafter, exceed a total of 120,000.

(f) All Federal agencies shall cooperate fully with the Commission to the end that it may effectively carry out its duties.

(g) Each member of the Commission who is not otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall receive the sum of \$100 for each day spent in the work of the Commission, shall be paid actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses, when away from his usual place of residence, in accordance with section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended. Each member of the Commission who is otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for such other service, but while engaged in the work of the Commission shall be paid actual travel expenses, when away from his usual place of residence, in accordance with the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended.

(h) There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

Sec. 22. (a) The designation of chapter 1, title II, is amended to read as follows: "CHAPTER 1—SELECTION SYSTEM".

(b) The title preceding section 201 is amended to read as follows: "NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS".

(c) The title preceding section 202 is amended to read as follows: "NUMERICAL LIMITATION TO ANY SINGLE FOREIGN STATE".

(d) The title preceding section 203 is amended to read as follows: "ALLOCATION OF IMMIGRANT VISAS".

(e) The title preceding section 204 is amended to read as follows: "PROCEDURE FOR GRANTING IMMIGRANT STATUS".

(f) The title preceding section 205 is amended to read as follows: "REVOCATION OF APPROVAL OF PETITIONS".

(g) The title preceding section 206 is amended to read as follows: "UNUSED IMMIGRANT VISAS".

(h) The title preceding section 207 is repealed.

(i) The title preceding section 224 of chapter 3, title II, is amended to read as follows: "IMMEDIATE RELATIVE AND SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISAS".

(j) The title preceding section 249 is amended to read as follows: "RECORD OF ADMISSION FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE IN THE CASE OF CERTAIN ALIENS WHO ENTERED THE UNITED STATES PRIOR TO JULY 1, 1924, OR JUNE 28, 1958".

Sec. 23. (a) The table of contents (Title II—Immigration, chapter 1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, is amended to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 1—SELECTION SYSTEM

"Sec. 201. Numerical limitations.

"Sec. 202. Numerical limitation to any single foreign state.

"Sec. 203. Allocation of immigrant visas.

"Sec. 204. Procedure for granting immigrant status.

"Sec. 205. Revocation of approval of petitions.

"Sec. 206. Unused immigrant visas."

(b) The table of contents (Title II—Immigration, chapter 3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, is amended by changing the designation of section 224 to read as follows:

"Sec. 224. Immediate relative and special immigrant visas."

(c) The table of contents (Title II—Immigration, chapter 5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by changing the designation of section 249 to read as follows:

"Sec. 249. Record of admission for permanent residence in the case of certain aliens who entered the United States prior to July 1, 1924, or June 28, 1958."

Sec. 24. Paragraph (6) of section 101(b) is repealed.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business for the day, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORTS ON OFFICERS ON DUTY WITH HEADQUARTERS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AND ARMY GENERAL STAFF

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army, and the Army General Staff, as of June 30, 1965 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF ARMY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CONTRACTS

A letter from the Assistant Executive Secretary, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of the Army research and development contracts, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

STATISTICAL SUPPLEMENT, STOCKPILE REPORT
A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statistical supplement, stockpile report, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS—PERSONNEL AND ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, Office of the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Federal contributions—personnel and administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT

A letter from the Executive Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Small Business Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON FEDERAL AID IN FISH AND WILDLIFE RESTORATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Federal aid in fish and wildlife restoration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON COMMISSARY ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE THE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, reporting, pursuant to law, that Department conducted no commissary activities outside the continental United States, during the fiscal year 1965; to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, during fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, during fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Tucson-Pima County Central Trades, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1781, to prohibit inter-

state trafficking in strikebreakers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1666, for the creation of additional judgeships in the U.S. courts of appeals; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 2070. A bill to provide for holding terms of the U.S. District Court for the District of South Dakota at Rapid City (Rept. No. 749).

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1357. A bill to revise existing bail practices in courts of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 750).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 98. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to extend through 1968 his proclamation of a period to "See the United States", and for other purposes (Rept. No. 752).

By Mrs. NEUBERGER, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

S. 774. A bill to provide that the Department of Commerce shall conduct a program of investigation, research, and survey to determine the practicability of the adoption by the United States of the metric system of weights and measures (Rept. No. 751).

SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES INVOLVING AMATEUR ATHLETICS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 753)

Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 147) providing for the settlement of disputes involving amateur athletics, and submitted a report thereon; which report was ordered to be printed, and the resolution to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

S. RES. 147

Whereas disputes have existed for many years between the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States, the National Collegiate Athletic Association, other amateur athletic organizations, and their affiliates or associates; and

Whereas these disputes have discouraged the full development of amateur athletics in the United States and the maximum performance by athletes representing the United States in international competition; and

Whereas the parties have not been able to resolve their differences through their own efforts or through previous arbitration efforts; and

Whereas it is necessary and desirable for the United States to maintain a vigorous amateur athletic program that will field the best possible teams in domestic and international competition, will protect and provide for the welfare of the individual amateur athlete, will achieve the broadest possible participation by amateur athletes in competitive sports, and will maintain a harmonious and cooperative relationship among all amateur athletic organizations; and

Whereas it is essential that means be provided whereby such disputes can be equitably and finally resolved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President of the Senate is hereby authorized to appoint an in-

dependent board of arbitration composed of five members, one of whom he shall designate as Chairman, for the purpose of considering disputes relating to the conduct, development, and protection of amateur athletics, which are submitted to it by the parties to such disputes, and rendering decisions determining such disputes which shall be consistent with the purposes of this resolution and shall be final and binding on such parties.

SEC. 2. In the consideration of disputes submitted to the Board appointed under this resolution the members of such Board should consider and determine all relevant facts and issues necessary to the attainment of the goals set out in the preamble to this resolution.

SEC. 3. Until such time as the Board appointed pursuant to this resolution renders its decision in the current dispute between the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States and the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the interested and affected parties should be governed by the following principles:

(a) An immediate and general amnesty shall be granted to all individuals, institutions, and organizations affected by this dispute in any amateur sport.

(b) Any disciplinary action proposed or pending against individuals, institutions, and organizations for reasons related to such dispute shall be vacated.

(c) Any discrimination against the full use of all available facilities for scheduled meets and tournaments shall be discontinued.

(d) Any restraints against participation by any athlete in scheduled meets and tournaments shall be discontinued.

SEC. 4. The Board appointed pursuant to this resolution shall report to the Senate not later than February 15, 1966, and from time to time thereafter as it may deem necessary, with respect to its activities under this resolution.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 2539. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate and maintain the San Felipe division, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 2540. A bill to authorize the conclusion of an agreement for the joint construction by the United States and Mexico of an international flood control project for the Tijuana River in accordance with the provisions of the treaty of February 3, 1944, with Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CANNON:

S. 2541. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. CANNON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 2542. A bill to amend the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

of the city of New York, published in the August 21, 1965, issue of America magazine:

The 21-member New York City Citizens' Anti-Pornography Commission, after having read two highly publicized pornographic novels and one typical smut magazine, declared in April this year that all were "obscene, filthy, indecent, and totally repugnant to our standards as representatives of the community." Commission members were "appalled that this material could be committed to print and distributed in the community," and that each had been declared not obscene by one court or another.

Thus, a cross section of the community voiced the urgency of dealing with what the New York Academy of Medicine has described as "the publication and vigorous promotion of salacious literature on an almost incomprehensibly vast scale."

There has recently been much "moaning at the bar" all over our land, and in the highest court of our land, about the "definition" of obscenity and the meaning of the term "community standards." The community standards test was set up by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1957: that matter is obscene which, when it is taken as a whole and contemporary community standards are applied, appeals to the prurient interest.

While discussion and debate continue, obscene material worth upward of \$2 billion pours from profit-hungry presses and flows over our children in tidal waves of pollution. Psychiatrists and police officials continue to point to the visible effects of the stimulus of pornography: rebellion against all authority (parental, police, educational, religious); illegitimate children; shattered lives of unwed teenage mothers and often fathers; venereal disease (which the New York Academy of Medicine says has reached epidemic proportions among our youth); an expanding teenage homosexual population; early marriages smashed by a type of philosophy advocating the necessity of fulfillment through a second mate; and finally, crimes of violence including rape and unpremeditated, often motiveless, murder.

How are we to combat this danger? How define obscenity? How express community standards?

It is obvious that definitions and reformulations of definitions are not the solution. There can never be any clearly drawn, concise definition of obscenity. Such a definition, however, is unnecessary, for an obscene action and thus the depiction of that action can be clearly and distinctly described. And the description of obscenity, its degrees and categories should be adequate to support valid legislation upon which courts may act.

The key to a description of obscenity lies in describing the obscene action—the dirty, foul, disgusting action. The obscene picture or narrative is such purely because of its relation to the action. When normal sexual action, deviated sexual action (such as homosexual acts or their preludes) or perverted sexual action (sadism, masochism, etc.) is performed in public, the performers are subject to arrest for engaging in obscene action. When these actions are transferred to public mass media, it follows that they must constitute obscenity. Obscenity, therefore, is simply the imaginative projection—in word, picture, magazine, book, record or tape—of obscene action. Normal, deviated or perverted sexual obscenity is the imaginative projection of the action for no other purpose than to stimulate the subconscious into imitation.

The Citizens' Anti-Pornography Commission, after its last meeting, filed a comprehensive report. It included proposed legislation, drafted by City Corporation Counsel Leo A. Larkin and submitted to the New York State Legislature. Since July 10, 1964, New

York State has been without a law that would protect those under 18. At that time, section 484-n of the penal law was erased from the books by a 4 to 3 vote in the New York Court of Appeals. Section 484-h made it a misdemeanor to sell, display, et cetera, to a minor "any book * * * the cover or content of which exploits, is devoted to, or is principally made up of descriptions of illicit sex or sexual immorality." The court majority called the law a violation of the 14th amendment, since it "denied due process of law in that the language is too vague for a criminal statute" (*People v. Bookcase, Inc.*).

Mr. Larkin's proposed legislation, to avoid charges of vagueness, describes those things which are objectionable for minors under 18 years of age. A bill perhaps even more descriptive than that authored by Mr. Larkin—written in clear, simple, unequivocal language—has passed the New York Assembly and Senate (but Governor Rockefeller vetoed it). I suggest that every State in the Union needs a statute that is graphically descriptive of what is objectionable for those under 18, and that makes no attempt to define obscenity—a clearly impossible task.

But enactment of descriptive legislation represents only one-third of the way toward a solution of the problem of obscene material among our children. Further responsibility rests with the courts and with a vocal and cooperative public. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover said in an article in the *University of Pittsburgh Law Review* (March 1964, vol. 25, p. 469): "An effective law is one that is sound and enforceable; one that meets the test of constitutional acceptability * * * one that receives the genuine support of an alert citizenry."

If laws dealing with the dissemination of obscene material to children are to be enforced, there must be complaints on the part of parents. It is unrealistic to suppose that law enforcement agencies—even special obscenity divisions, however abundantly manned—could patrol or police all dealers in any city. But citizen complaints are not all that is required; necessary also is the appearance in court, once or several times, of the complaining parent along with the injured child, who must be a complaining witness.

We may also consider, here, the possibility of establishing a special court or part of the court to protect children involved. Statutes dealing with the dissemination of noxious materials to minors are part of the Criminal Code, and infractions are tried in criminal courts. Experience in cases arising under the now defunct section 484-h of the penal law showed that children already exposed to the sordid foulness of pornography were now being thrust into the equally sordid atmosphere of the present parts of the criminal court. Congested calendars and adjournments forced them, in some cases, to make repeated appearances in this atmosphere, causing them in addition to lose precious time from school.

Some effort must be made, then, to safeguard the welfare of such children, or the very persons the law is intended to protect will become its victims. A part of the court should be established so that children will have some separation from the general congestion of the criminal court. Such a part is presently established in New York, for example, for women charged with prostitution and related offenses. This is in no way intended to suggest that the defendant should be denied a public trial, but merely to point out that some discretion must be exercised to protect innocent children.

Another responsibility incumbent upon citizens is the vocal expression of their objections to the existing situation in the area of obscenity. Since, in almost all obscenity cases, the "community standards" test is ap-

plied, the judiciary must be made aware of what these standards are. The public must make itself heard, for the outrage of the public is meaningless unless it is expressed and is noted by the judiciary, by lawmakers, by elected officials, by law-enforcement agencies.

As a matter of fact, concern is already widespread. It has inspired several citizens' groups to work together toward promoting a unified expression of standards. Once each month, in a synagogue on Manhattan's East 20th Street, two dozen men of all faiths—from the fields of medicine, law, public relations, journalism, communications, business and industry—meet with two Catholic priests, two Protestant ministers, a Jewish rabbi, a Mormon Mission head and a representative of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America. These men form the board of directors of a New York organization called Operation Yorkville. At each meeting, after discussion and exchange of ideas, they shape plans for a month of action to combat the influence of pornography among children. They are working—in the idiom of the late Father John LaFarge—"jointly on a necessary project."

On May 6, members of the New York Board of Trade, the New York Academy of Medicine, the Rotary and Knights of Columbus together called upon high-ranking clergymen from the metropolitan area to meet with them at the Waldorf-Astoria. These men, too, have been brought together by a common anxiety over the astonishingly large and free flow of obscenity and its effects on our children—who manage to get their curious hands on 75 to 90 percent of it. They appealed to Catholic bishops and their Protestant counterparts, to Jewish rabbis, Seventh-Day Adventists, and Greek and Syrian Orthodox clergy to work with them on the "necessary project." The result of their appeal was a unanimous resolution by the clergymen to work through pastoral letters and sermons.

Sporadic expression of public opinion, however, has proved ineffective. It must be continuous. As things are now, community standards cannot be effectively expressed for want of organization. Even if there is vigorous self-expression as a result of community meetings, community reaction of its very nature is scattered.

The Citizens' Anti-Pornography Commission has recommended the establishment of permanent representative commissions in every city and State of the Nation, implemented by citizens advisory groups chosen by lot from voters' registration lists. Others have suggested the establishment of full-time centers in major cities such as New York, Chicago and Los Angeles. These centers would be staffed by legal and public relations experts who would work at channeling latent public expression and aiming it in a unified and organized way toward productive focal points.

However it is accomplished, it is necessary that the voice of the people be heard. As J. Edgar Hoover concludes in the article mentioned above: "Citizen cooperation is essential in all phases of law enforcement, for the best efforts of even the most efficient police department are meaningless unless * * * a community-wide front is established against corruption and crime. Nowhere is the role of this community-wide front more vitally important than in the fight against merchants of filth."

Bill file
SENATOR YOUNG OF OHIO OPPOSES
HOUSE IMMIGRATION BILL, H.R.
2580, AS AMENDED

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

September 16, 1965

23208

tleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the junior Senator from Ohio has attempted to involve me in a controversy of his own making in the other body. I decline to be drawn into this controversy which was manufactured by the junior Senator from Ohio.

The senior Senator from Connecticut is a distinguished American who has been a friend and confidant of President Johnson for 30 years. He has won a place in the history of our Nation and is well able to defend himself in the other body.

Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King is recognized as the outstanding leader of his people. He has won international recognition. His place in the history of our Nation is also assured. Dr. King is well able to defend his position and has public platforms available to him for that purpose.

But the junior Senator from Ohio has dragged an irrelevant issue into his efforts to generate a controversy in the Senate. He has ruthlessly castigated two distinguished Americans who are in no way involved with the controversy and who have no public platform available to them to answer the intemperate and false charges voiced by the junior Senator from Ohio. I refer to the able and highly respected and well known staff director of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy, Edward M. O'Connor, and Philip J. Corso, who has earned an outstanding record of military and civilian service to our country over a period of 22 years.

Edward M. O'Connor has been associated with problems of immigration for the past 20 years. In 1948 he was appointed by President Harry S. Truman as U.S. Commissioner of Displaced Persons and was confirmed as such by the U.S. Senate. He served with outstanding distinction in that position until 1952 when the work of the Displaced Persons Commission was completed. Following that service he was called upon to serve as a professional staff member of the U.S. Psychological Strategy Board, established by President Truman, an arm of the National Security Council. He served in a similar capacity during the administration of President Eisenhower with the Operations Coordinating Board, also an arm of the National Security Council. Following that service he became staff director of the House Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, whose monumental work was produced in 27 official reports of the House, which today stand unchallenged for accuracy and completeness on the issue of the conspiracy of communism against freemen and nations. He then became a consultant to our Government on international information programs and was called upon by both Senate and House committees for advice and assistance in this critical area of Government operations. After serving for 4 years as director of special projects at Canisius College in Buffalo, a Jesuit institution of higher learning, he returned to Washington to become staff director of the

Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy of which I have the honor to serve as chairman. It is worth noting that he has been honored by many foreign governments as well as many national organizations of our country, including recognition as the leading Catholic layman in the field of Catholic action in 1950 which earned him a decoration by the late Pope Pius XII.

Philip J. Corso served as combat and intelligence officer in the U.S. Army during World War II and during the Korean war. As a combat officer in Europe he won many decorations for valor and at the end of hostilities in Europe became chief of U.S. intelligence in Rome, Italy. In that capacity he served the cause of democracy then struggling to survive in Italy and his work won the enmity of the enemies of democracy, most notably the Communists in Italy.

While in Rome, Italy, Philip J. Corso came to know personally the late Pope, Pius XII, and the present Pope Paul, who was then Vatican secretary of state. After his tour of duty in Italy he received the Order of the Crown of Italy, the War Cross for Valor, and was made a Knight of Malta.

With the Korean war, Philip Corso again served as combat and intelligence officer in our efforts to turn back the notorious Red Chinese aggression against the people of free Korea. He then became a member of the U.S. truce delegation at Panmunjon where his knowledge of Communist tactics again served our country.

Following this service he was returned to the United States to become a professional staff member of the Operations Coordination Board of the National Security Council. In that capacity, he served with distinction, including research adviser to our Nation's spokesmen in the United Nations, winning for him four Cabinet citations.

He later became commander of the first activated U.S. missile battalion in Europe. Following this tour of duty he again returned to the United States to become Chief of Scientific Intelligence to the great American, Gen. Arthur J. Trudeau, Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, Department of Defense.

Philip J. Corso retired from the U.S. Army with a record of outstanding service to his country. His many decorations and recognitions by our Government attest to his outstanding service. I am proud to have him as a member of my personal staff. He is not on the staff of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy, as stated by the junior Senator from Ohio, and this stands as the least important error in his misguided statement on the floor of the Senate today. Colonel Corso's long and distinguished service to our country ably qualifies him as one who knows the danger of the international Communist conspiracy to our free and representative form of government, and, with which naive persons are unfamiliar and thus attempt to brush aside.

The context and timing of the intemperate and misguided remarks of the

junior Senator from Ohio against two outstanding Americans, raise the question of motive. Is the junior Senator from Ohio attempting to block passage of the immigration bill passed by the House which was scheduled for debate in the Senate today? Could it be that the junior Senator from Ohio suffers from an acute case of frustration because the immigration bill he introduced has been rejected by the steady will of Congress at work. It is well known that the junior Senator from Ohio has been completely misinformed about the nature of the immigration bill passed by the House. He labors under the impression that the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality does not exist. He apparently is not aware that major provisions of the bill which will come before the Senate tomorrow is the healthy product of the House subcommittee and bears no relationship to the bill which he introduced. If he will take the time to read the report on the immigration bill before the Senate he will find there a clear statement on the role played by the House subcommittee in producing an immigration bill which won the overwhelming support of the House and which I trust will merit the same recognition by the Senate.

A REVIEW OF THE KENNEDY CENTER SITE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the location of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts has been debated widely in the past several months. As we move closer to actual construction on the banks of the Potomac, more and more thoughtful citizens have expressed their concern that we might not be building the best center on the best site.

Because I believe that we should be sure this tremendous project will fulfill its promise, I am today introducing a resolution directing the National Capital Planning Commission to make an immediate study of the site now selected for the Kennedy Center, and other proposed sites. No construction would be begun until the Congress has had 90 days in which to consider the Commission's report, which would be submitted within 90 days of the enactment of the resolution.

The argument over the pros and cons of a riverside site for the Center is not new. It has continued since 1958, when the Congress decided to use the Mall site originally intended for such a Center as the location for the Smithsonian Air Museum, and hastily designated the Potomac site as a substitute home for an arts center. At that time there were valid questions about the wisdom of this move. The great advances in planning for the National Capital in the past 7 years have provoked more doubts and introduced new questions which should be considered now, before it is too late.

Our distinguished colleagues, Congressman WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, of New



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 111

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1965

No. 170

Senate

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whose keeping, in spite of the willful folly of Thy wayward children, are the destinies of men and of nations, Thou hast called us whose time here is passing swiftly as a watch in the night to labor with Thee in the unfolding of Thy purpose for the ages.

In the midst of decisions that concern fearful forces of nature which if not harnessed by mutual good will or even by self-interest, may destroy us utterly, making a mockery of the flimsy pretension of our frontiers and spiteful walls, may there be given to those who speak for the nations in these dread times greatness of outlook that the keys of the new power in man's hands may be used to open doors not of peril but of plenty for the whole earth.

In all our deliberations strengthen us with the realization that in the supreme tests only the soul is decisive and that only the spirit can save the flesh.

We ask it in the name of Him who in human flesh revealed the soaring splendor of the spirit. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, September 14, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures of the Committee on Government Operations; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and the Antitrust and Monopoly

Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Vernol R. Jansen, Jr., of Alabama, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Alabama;

Macon L. Weaver, of Alabama, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Alabama; and

James E. Luckie, of Georgia, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Georgia.

By Mr. BAYH, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Casimir J. Pajakowski, of Indiana, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Indiana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the executive calendar.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of nomina-

tions on the Executive Calendar for the United Nations only.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations to the United Nations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and agreed to en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Petitions signed by Valdis Bervalds and Ingeborg Bervalds, both of Manchester, Conn., relating to the liberation of the Baltic States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association, approving in principle the provisions of title II, of House bill 8207, insofar as they provide procedures relating to judicial and congressional salaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Schenectady Typographical Union No. 167, favoring the

22979

September 15, 1965

22980

enactment of Senate bill 1781, to prohibit interstate trafficking in strikebreakers; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 3989. An act to extend to 30 days the time for filing petitions for removal of civil actions from State to Federal courts (Rept. No. 712).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1804. A bill to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the U.S. Court of Claims, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 711).

By Mr. HRUSKA, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1407. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Lipp (Rept. No. 713); and

H.R. 4596. An act for the relief of Myra Knowles Snelling (Rept. No. 714).

By Mr. BAYH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1049. A bill to provide relief for the heirs and devisees of Fly and Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottees (Rept. No. 715);

H.R. 1395. An act for the relief of Irene McCafferty (Rept. No. 716);

H.R. 2694. An act for the relief of John Allen (Rept. No. 717);

H.R. 4603. An act for the relief of Lt. (jg.) Harold Edward Henning, U.S. Navy (Rept. No. 718);

H.R. 5839. An act for the relief of Sgt. Donald R. Hurrie, U.S. Marine Corps (Rept. No. 719);

H.R. 5902. An act for the relief of Cecil Graham (Rept. No. 720);

H.R. 6726. An act for the relief of William S. Perrigo (Rept. No. 721); and

H.R. 7682. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Christian Voss (Rept. No. 722).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 27. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual National Farmers Week (Rept. No. 723);

S.J. Res. 86. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim a "Day of Recognition" for firefighters (Rept. No. 724);

S.J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to designate the 7th day of November in 1966 as "National Teachers' Day" (Rept. No. 725); and

S.J. Res. 101. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the calendar year 1966 as "The Year of the Bible" (Rept. No. 726).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H.R. 9877. An act to amend the act of January 30, 1913, as amended, to remove certain restrictions on the American Hospital of Paris (Rept. No. 727).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 331. A bill for the relief of Warren F. Coleman, Jr. (Rept. No. 729);

S. 337. A bill for the relief of F. F. Hintze (Rept. No. 730);

S. 577. A bill for the relief of Mary F. Morse (Rept. No. 731);

H.R. 1221. An act for the relief of Betty H. Going (Rept. No. 732);

S. 2273. A bill to render immune from seizure under judicial process certain objects of cultural significance imported into the United States for temporary display or exhibition, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 747);

H.R. 2926. An act for the relief of Efstahia Giannos (Rept. No. 733);

H.R. 2933. An act for the relief of Kim Jai Sung (Rept. No. 734);

H.R. 3062. An act for the relief of Son Chung Ja (Rept. No. 735);

H.R. 3337. An act for the relief of Mrs. Antonio de Oyarzabal (Rept. No. 736);

H.R. 3765. An act for the relief of Miss Rosa Basile DeSantis (Rept. No. 737);

H.R. 5252. An act to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members of the Air Force (Rept. No. 738);

H.R. 5903. An act for the relief of William C. Page (Rept. No. 739);

H.R. 6294. An act to authorize Secret Service agents to make arrests without warrant for offenses committed in their presence, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 740);

H.R. 7090. An act for the relief of certain individuals (Rept. No. 741);

H.R. 8212. An act for the relief of Kent A. Herath (Rept. No. 742); and

H.R. 8352. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Foreign Service of the United States (Rept. No. 743).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1898. A bill for the relief of certain aliens (Rept. No. 728); and

S. 1924. A bill to amend section 39b of the Bankruptcy Act so as to prohibit a part-time referee from acting as trustee or receiver in any proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act (Rept. No. 744).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 405. A bill for the relief of Gabriel A. Nahas, Vera Nahas, Albert Gabriel Nahas, and Frederika-Maria Nahas (Rept. No. 745); and

S. 2039. A bill for the relief of Yasuo Tsukikawa (Rept. No. 746).

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY, ADDITIONAL, AND SEPARATE VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 748)

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably, with an amendment, the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, together with the minority views of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]; the additional views of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]; and the separate views of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and I submit a report thereon.

I ask unanimous consent that the report, together with the minority views, additional views, and separate views be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2534. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to regulate the depreciation accounting of air carriers; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 2535. A bill to amend the act of March 1, 1933 (47 Stat. 1418), entitled "An act to permanently set aside certain lands in Utah as an addition to the Navajo Indian Reservation, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. INOUE:

S. 2536. A bill for the relief of Shiad Tan Ming; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 2537. A bill for the relief of Rina Centofanti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT (by request):

S. 2538. A bill to amend section 607(d) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BARTLETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

REGULATION OF DEPRECIATION ACCOUNTING OF AIR CARRIERS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to regulate the depreciation accounting of air carriers. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter from the Vice Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a statement of purpose and need for the legislation, and a comparison with existing law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter, statement, and comparison will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2534) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to regulate the depreciation accounting of air carriers introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter, statement, and comparison, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, are as follows:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, D.C., August 24, 1965.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Civil Aeronautics Board recommends to the Congress for its consideration the enclosed draft of a proposed bill "To amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to regulate the depreciation accounting of air carriers."

The Board has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the transmission of the draft bill to the Congress from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. MURPHY,
Vice Chairman.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION; A BILL "TO AMEND THE FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958 SO AS TO AUTHORIZE THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD TO REGULATE THE DEPRECIATION ACCOUNTING OF AIR CARRIERS"

In common with other regulatory acts, and carrying forward the provision of section 407 (d) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 directs that the Board

September 14, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A5155

In a few years you will be 21, and others your age will have the right to vote—but you will not. You will be a citizen of your State and country, but you will have no voice in public affairs.

Someday the Governor may pardon you and restore your rights, but it is going to be humiliating to ask him. He'll want to know your whole record. It is a bad one.

I am granting you a parole. A parole is in no sense a pardon. You will report to the men who have accepted your parole as often as they may ask. Your convenience is not a matter of importance. You will also obey your parents. If your parents send you to bed at 9 o'clock, you will go without complaint. You will perform such tasks as are assigned to you. Your parole is a fragile thing.

Should the slightest complaint of your conduct reach this court, your parole will be revoked immediately and you will begin serving your sentence. You will not be brought back here for questioning and/or explanations. You will be picked up and taken to prison—without notice to you and without delay.

The World Court and World Peace Through Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the editorial page of today's Washington Post contains an appropriate welcome for the participants in the Washington Conference on World Peace Through Law. This editorial echoes the sense of Congress as expressed in House Concurrent Resolution 468, which was unanimously enacted recently.

The 2,500 participants in this Conference are among the foremost legal authorities in the world. Congress should look closely at the results of their deliberations. Particular attention should be paid to suggestions for how the United States can make the World Court more effective.

The editorial follows:

THE QUEST FOR WORLD LAW

Washington today becomes the focal point of the world-law movement. Four continental conferences in recent years led to the Conference on World Peace Through Law in Athens 2 years ago, and now some 2,500 judges and lawyers from 110 countries have assembled here for the similar purpose of extending the boundaries of international justice. They will talk in lofty terms of replacing violence with law, but most of their time will be spent on the vital business of improving courts, extending research, bridging legal gaps and analyzing the so-called treaty-making "explosion."

These lawyers and judges are practical men. They have no expectation of substituting world law for diplomacy and military force in the present context of international relations. What they seek is a speedup in the natural evolution of international law and judicial institutions. One of the problems they will tackle here will be the unification of some aspects of commercial law and the promotion of arbitration arrangements so that business may be more easily transacted across international lines. Another important question for discussion will be

the extension of law to the no man's land of outer space.

To the pessimists who see no hope for a lawful world the sponsors of this movement reply that 80 percent of all the treaties known to man have been drafted in the last 20 years. Treaties are the primary staple of international law. Not all of them are constructive in purpose, but the mere proliferation of treaties suggests a widespread desire for orderly international relations. Treaties have multiplied faster than the means of interpreting and enforcing them, and this problem too will get much attention from the Conference.

We are especially hopeful that the Conference will be able to show how the World Court can be made more effective. This is one area in which the United States, with its crippling restriction as to the jurisdiction of the Court, is sadly out of harmony with the growing demand for law in the settlement of international disputes. By simply embracing the principle of judicial settlement of all legal disputes that may be properly carried to the World Court, the United States could make an enormous contribution to the "new world of law" that every statesman likes to talk about.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Record I would like to include my report to the people of the Seventh District of Alabama for May 20, 1965.

WASHINGTON REPORT

(From Congressman JIM MARTIN)

CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Crime is the Nation's No. 1 problem. Our greatest challenge is to make our streets and highways and homes safe against the violence of murderers, rapists, and thieves. Nowhere is the challenge greater than right here in the Nation's Capital. Serious crime in the District of Columbia increased for the 35th consecutive month during April. There was an increase of 3,018 offenses in April 1965 over the same month a year ago. In just this 1 month there were 385 robberies; 886 housebreakings; 19 rapes. Crime increased in every crime category except criminal homicide. Five criminal murders were committed in April. Compare this figure for this one city with crime figures in the whole State of Alabama.

One of the reasons for the rising crime rate in Washington and throughout the Nation is the increasing leniency by the courts toward criminals. This was noted by J. Edgar Hoover who said recently, "Some members of the judiciary appear to be more concerned for the rights of repeating criminal offenders than for the unfortunate members of the public who are victimized by unrehabilitated burglars, robbers, rapists, and murderers." The increase in crime is a problem to be faced by Congress as well as every law-abiding American citizen.

TRADE WITH REDS

Communist Russia has always used trade as one of its strategic weapons in accomplishing its goal of conquering the world. The trade history of those countries who have tried to deal with the Communists reveals the ugly facts of how the Reds manipulate

trade agreements to further the end of aggression and world conquest. In the face of the facts of history, it is surprising to find President Johnson now advocating expanding trade with the Communists. It is logical that Americans should ask, "Should we help the Communists by furnishing them with the goods they apparently cannot produce for themselves?"

Our advantage over the Communists in the cold war has been our productive genius. We have outstripped them in every field. Much of the unrest behind the Iron Curtain is caused by the failure of communism to provide the goods and services the people demand of any economic system. Now we come to an important decision: Should we help the Communist leaders strengthen their control over their own people and the nations they hold in bondage by providing them with consumer goods they cannot produce in the same quantity or quality as we can? In other words, should we help the Communists strengthen their own economy and help them make good their boast to bury us? It seems to me Congress and the American people had better take a long hard look at President Johnson's proposal for expanding trade with the Communists. American businessmen had better note the warning of history before they go too far in approving expanded trade with a self-announced enemy whose sole objective is the complete destruction of private enterprise and those governments in which private enterprise flourishes.

NATO TASK FORCE

As a member of the Republican task force on NATO and the Atlantic community, I had an opportunity to discuss the worsening relations of the United States with our NATO allies. While Republicans almost unanimously support President Johnson's determined action against Communist aggression in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, we are deeply concerned about the seeming tendency to conduct foreign policy on a basis of political expediency rather than on a well-thought-out and constructive course of action.

A number of problems were discussed by our task force in a day-long meeting with members of the Foreign Policy Research Institute. Heading the delegation from the Research Institute was Dr. Robert Strausz-Hupe, professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania. For many years Dr. Strausz-Hupe has been recognized as an outstanding authority on Communist strategy, American foreign policy, the political, and military problems of NATO, and U.S. security affairs.

Our discussions with this eminent group of educators and experts in foreign policy will make it possible for me and the other members of the Republican task force to give to the people concrete facts. I hope our investigations may lead to the formulation of a foreign policy program which will be a much more effective force for keeping peace and freedom in the world than the confused and sometimes stumbling approach of both President Kennedy and President Johnson.

VOTING RIGHTS BILL FIGHT SHAPES UP

The liberals are determined to create havoc in the South. The House Judiciary Committee, under the chairmanship of Democrat EMANUEL CELLER of New York, has reported out a bill which contains a provision to abolish the poll tax in State and local elections. The Speaker of the House has endorsed this provision. Such a move to control State and local election laws is clearly unconstitutional, and I predict a real battle when this bill comes up for debate in the House. The Republicans will have a substitute bill which will protect the rights of the States to determine their own election laws and voter qualifications. The voting rights bill is now before the Rules Committee and can be expected to be sent to the House

A5156

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 14, 1965

shortly. The Alabama delegation in the House will be unanimous in its determination to protect our State and the South against this punitive legislation.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Record, I would like to include my newsletter to the people of the Seventh District of Alabama for September 13, 1965:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(From Congressman JIM MARTIN)

FOREIGN AID FUNDS APPROVED—RE STUDY
REJECTED

The House of Representatives, with an overwhelming Democrat majority, approved a \$4.1 billion foreign aid bill. Although this amount is about \$147½ million less than the President asked for in the 1966 budget, it is almost \$92 million more than was spent on foreign aid in fiscal year 1965. This is a bookkeeping trick of the L.B.J. administration to make the people believe he is saving money—appropriation bills are passed which are below budget estimates, but higher than the amount spent in the preceding year. Thus, a Congressman can have it both ways by telling the people he voted to save money by cutting the President's budget, while actually he approves increased spending.

The minority views of the Republicans, which called for a restudy of the whole foreign aid program before approving additional billions was, as usual, rejected by the Democrat majority. The minority report to the foreign aid bill clearly shows how little is known about how foreign aids funds are used and how they are spent. For many years Republicans have presented some very basic reasons for redirecting our whole foreign aid program. The Congress and the American people have the right to know the size of American foreign aid programs.

CUTS COULD BE MADE

The minority report shows that foreign aid spending for 1966 could be cut without endangering U.S. foreign policy, conduct of the war in Vietnam, or our commitments to friendly nations. Here are some facts on foreign aid the people generally do not know:

1. The magnitude of foreign aid spending is not fully known by the average taxpayer. Total requests for foreign assistance purposes have been submitted to Congress this year amounting to over \$7½ billion.

2. The unexpended balance (money appropriated in previous years and not yet spent) as of June 30, 1965, is estimated to be over \$10.6 billion. This means we would not have to make any new appropriations for 2 years, plenty of time to restudy the whole program.

3. Our commercial trade balance with countries receiving our aid has dropped sharply since 1960. The Latin American commercial trade balance is particularly alarming.

4. There is a definite relationship between the gold outflow and the Federal Government's programs of spending in foreign countries.

5. We are frequently told not to worry about the dollars spent for foreign aid because most of them are spent in this country.

This is not quite true. Close examination shows that money spent in this country is for total commodity purchases. In fiscal 1963 total foreign aid appropriations were \$5.17 billion, but only \$855 million was spent on commodity purchases, so only a small portion of foreign aid money is spent in this country.

6. There is strong evidence that administration officials pay little attention to the intent of Congress when it comes to spending the foreign aid money which Congress authorizes.

I do not advocate the complete elimination of all foreign aid programs, but before supporting additional spending greater emphasis must be placed on encouraging private development resources of our own and in the developing countries; and initiating projects of a grassroots nature such as feeding the hungry and development of education programs in which we know our aid will reach the mass of the people and not just a selected few foreign government officials.

WHAT WE REALLY SPEND ON FOREIGN AID

The people are led to believe that all foreign aid funds are in the mutual security bill. However, the following table shows the many foreign assistance programs and the amount the President has requested in the first 6 months of 1965:

New foreign aid funds requested in 1965

[In thousand dollars]

Foreign assistance requests, as amended (mutual security)...	3,459,470
Receipts and recoveries from previous credits.....	209,770
Military Assistance Advisory Group.....	76,000
Export-Import Bank (long-term credits).....	900,000
Public Law 480 (agricultural commodities).....	1,658,000
Inter-American Development Bank (Latin America).....	705,880
International Development Association (IDA).....	104,000
Peace Corps.....	115,000
Contributions to international organizations.....	98,953
Permanent construction overseas (military).....	85,986
Education (foreign and other students).....	69,200
Ryukyu Islands.....	14,733
Migrants and refugees.....	7,575
Atomic Energy Commission (overseas).....	5,900
Inter-American Highway (Latin America).....	4,000

Total new foreign aid requests, first 6 months of 1965..... 7,512,467

Audit Etiquette

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1965

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Internal Revenue Service at Cleveland has issued an interesting publication for its employees entitled "Audit Etiquette" which I wish to include with my remarks in the Record. I think it is a commendable effort on the part of the IRS to establish and maintain a good relationship with the individual income taxpayer whose

account is under consideration by the Service.

I am particularly pleased to call this to the attention of the House because the idea for the publication grew out of conversations between IRS officials and Attorney George J. Tzangas of Canton, Ohio, one of the younger leaders in his profession, and in civic affairs in my hometown:

AUDIT ETIQUETTE

Be attentive to your personal appearance. Be on time for all appointments.

Assure the taxpayer that examinations are necessary for compliance.

Deal with the taxpayer in a courteous and positive manner.

Confine your activities to the areas necessary in the examination.

Conduct your examination with a minimum of taxpayer inconvenience.

Use your time effectively.

Take care of records entrusted to you.

Return all records to where obtained.

Raise only real issues—never any for trading or bargaining purposes.

Clearly explain the results of your examination.

Avoid letting personal feelings influence your conduct or decisions.

Allow the taxpayer ample opportunity to substantiate his position.

Give objective consideration to explanations given by taxpayer.

Advise taxpayer of all his rights.

Compliment the taxpayer's record-keeping when deserving.

Never criticize the taxpayer or his representative.

Personal problems are never discussed.

Personal favors are never requested or accepted.

Conduct yourself in a professional manner.

Keep in mind the importance of good public relations.

Bill

The New Immigration Bill Which Passed the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1965

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following interesting newspaper article entitled, "Immigration Bill Will Benefit Italians," written by Jack Steele, Scripps-Howard staff writer, published in today's issue of the Washington Daily News:

IMMIGRATION BILL WILL BENEFIT ITALIANS—60,000 A YEAR EXPECTED TO ENTER UNITED STATES

(By Jack Steele)

Nearly 250,000 Italians who want to move to the United States will be the major beneficiaries of the new immigration bill which now seems certain to clear Congress this year.

State Department officials estimate that under the bill, which will abolish the 40-year-old national-origins immigration system, 60,000 Italian immigrants will enter the United States in the next 3 years.

This is nearly four times as many as could be admitted under present law.

Italian immigration presumably will continue at this 20,000-a-year rate—the maxi-

September 14, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A5157

num set for any nation under the bill—for at least a decade before the so-called over-subscribed list of Italian visa applicants is exhausted. At last count the list numbered 249,583.

The bill also will boost substantially the immigration from such countries as Greece, Portugal, Poland, China, and India—as well as from the newly independent Caribbean nations of Jamaica and Trinidad-Tobago.

QUOTAS POOLED

The new immigration system will not become fully effective until July 1, 1968. Meantime unused quotas of Britain and other countries will be placed in a pool to be used by nations with oversubscribed quotas.

The State Department says this pooling arrangement will clear for most countries except Italy the backlogs of visa applicants who get preferential treatment under the U.S. immigration laws.

Preferences go to relatives of U.S. citizens and alien residents and to persons with special job skills.

When the new law becomes fully operative in 1968 it is expected to increase total U.S. immigration by 35,000 to 50,000 a year. Immigration has averaged 290,000 a year for the past decade.

The bill, which cleared the Senate Judiciary Committee last week and is expected to be enacted without major change, will place these annual limits on future immigration: 170,000 from all countries outside the Western Hemisphere; 120,000 from Western Hemisphere countries.

In addition, 35,000 to 50,000 members of immediate families of U.S. citizens (parents, spouses and children) are expected to be admitted each year as nonquota immigrants.

ESTIMATES

The State Department has prepared these estimates of immigration boosts from major countries under the new bill:

Greece: 11,707 in the next 3 years compared with the present annual quota of 308.

Portugal: 1,554 in 3 years compared to its present annual quota of 438.

Poland: 28,718 in 3 years compared to its present annual quota of 6,488.

Asian countries which now have negligible quotas, also would get substantial increases.

The 3-year totals estimated under the new bill include 5,964 for India, 19,135 for China, and 988 for the Philippines.

The new China quota will include "Chinese persons" living in other countries.

The new bill will establish six preference categories, mostly for more distant relatives of U.S. citizens and aliens living in this country.

A new, third-preference category will be for members of the professions, scientists, and artists, and a sixth-preference category will be set for skilled or unskilled persons needed to fill labor shortages in the United States.

Only after these preference categories are exhausted will nonpreference immigrants be admitted.

The Reason for Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the political practitioners who have imposed the war on poverty on the

American people make every effort to show that those who oppose the program are against people or at least are blind to the desirability of raising family incomes which are very low.

But as the poverty war goes on it is becoming more widely understood that the greatest benefits are going to the "warriors" themselves, and so we see groups vying with each other for control of the program. It is becoming a question, as some have said, of who owns the poor.

The radio commentator, Paul Harvey, recently made some useful comments on this subject, and I include those comments here because of their general interest:

THE COST OF HANDING OUT THE HANDOUTS
(By Paul Harvey)

A city welfare worker in Chicago is paid \$4,800 to \$15,000 a year.

These are the people who hand out the handouts.

There are some even more plush patronage plums being plucked by party faithfuls under the Federal antipoverty program.

In Paterson, N.J., the director of the program is paid \$18,500 a year. This is a thousand dollars more than the annual salary of the mayor of Paterson.

The New Jersey State director gets \$25,000. The local Washington, D.C., director gets \$25,000.

There are at least two dozen staff members in the antipoverty program who are paid from \$10,000 to \$23,000 yearly.

A Negro leader in Chicago says the war on poverty in Chicago is being run for the benefit of Mayor Daley's political machine.

The Reverend Lynward Stevenson says the antipoverty payrollers in Chicago include 6 ward committeemen and 31 city hall appointees.

Is this antipoverty effort a smokescreen behind which to hide more millions of political payola?

Sargent Shriver, commander in chief of the President's war on poverty, will pay 54 of his civilian generals from \$19,000 to \$30,000 per year.

The Poverty Operations Board of New York City has on its payroll one person who is paid \$500 a week as a part-time consultant. This same person is also a consultant to other government agencies.

Another New York consultant at \$65 a day also happens to be a prominent Democrat and a city judge.

Almost forgotten now is the fact that this mammoth nationwide antipoverty war began as an effort to aid impoverished people in the coalfields of West Virginia and thereabouts.

Some of us, who have long resisted the compulsion to spend for the sake of spending on foreign aid, have insisted these doles might better be employed helping home folks.

When the President announced his intention to divert tax dollars to artificial respiration in Appalachia, we were willing to give that effort a chance.

Now it has turned into something far different—a billion dollar slush fund for playing pork-barrel politics.

Aid for home folks, in whatever form, is potent vote bait.

But so grotesquely top heavy is this boondoggle that Americans might rightly begin to wonder whether this war can be won by employing an army of high salaried mercenaries.

In Gum Springs, Va., \$74,000 has been earmarked to fight poverty for 1 year—\$54,000 of that will go to staff salaries.

Schedule for Conference on World Peace
Through Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington World Conference on World Peace Through Law begins today at the Washington-Hilton Hotel. Chief Justice Earl Warren is honorary chairman, and former Presidents Dwight Eisenhower and Harry Truman are honorary cochairmen of the Conference Sponsors Committee.

Members of Congress have been graciously invited to participate without paying the usual \$50 registration fee. The full schedule of remaining activities is printed below. Discussions of each of these interesting topics is lead by a prominent international jurist. I plan to attend several of the events and hope that my colleagues will take advantage of the opportunity.

The schedule follows:

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1965

From 9 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.: Working session I—Section 1. Topic 1: "Existing and Proposed International Courts."

From 9 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.: Working session I—Section II. Topic 2: "Space Law."

From 1 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.: Luncheon.

From 2:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.: Working session II—Section I. Topic 3: "International Law in Domestic Courts."

From 2:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.: Working session II—Section II. Topic 4: "International Communications."

From 9 p.m. to 11 p.m.: An evening at the National Gallery of Art (black tie).

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1965

From 9 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.: Working session III—Section I. Topic 5: "Transnational Trade and Investment."

From 9 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.: Working session III—Section II. Topic 6: "Arbitration Tribunals."

From 1 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.: Luncheon.

From 2:30 p.m. to 5 p.m.: Working session IV—Section I. Topic 7: "Human Rights."

From 2:30 p.m. to 5 p.m.: Working session IV—Section II. Topic 8: "International Judicial Cooperation."

From 6 p.m. to 8 p.m.: Reception: Chief Justice, U.S. Supreme Court (by invitation).

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 1965

From 9 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.: Working session V—Section I. Topic 9: "Disarmament."

From 9 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.: Working session V—Section II. Topic 10: "Industrial and Intellectual Property."

From 1 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.: Luncheon.

From 2:30 p.m. to 5 p.m.: Working session VI—Section I. Topic 11: "Creative Research and Education in International Law."

From 2:30 p.m. to 5 p.m.: Working session VI—Section II. Topic 12: "Expanding Structures of International Law: General Principles, Peace-keeping, International Organizations, etc."

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1965

From 9 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.: Plenary session: Presentation of summaries of committee reports and panel rapporteur reports.

From 1 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.: Luncheon.

A5158

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 14, 1965

From 3 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.: Plenary session:
Work program for the future.
At 7 p.m.: Reception.
At 8 p.m.: Banquet (black tie). Presentation of world law awards.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1965

From 9 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.: Plenary session:
Adoption of reports; approval of Washington document.

U.S. Civil Rights Groups Blamed for Stirring Hate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1965

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the following article by George S. Schuyler needs no comment by me. It speaks for itself and is something which should be read by everybody who is truly interested in contributing to a solution of the race problem:

[From the Times-Picayune, Sept. 2, 1965]

U.S. CIVIL RIGHTS GROUPS BLAMED FOR STIRRING HATE

PEOPLE BETRAYED, NEGRO JOURNALIST SAYS

(By George S. Schuyler)

(George Samuel Schuyler, 70-year-old Negro reporter and editor, is associate editor of the Pittsburgh Courier, a weekly Negro newspaper with a circulation of 59,836. A journalist for more than 40 years, Schuyler has long expressed belief that civil rights leaders are encouraging the Negro masses to bitterness and lawlessness. Some of his journalistic adventures have been as special correspondent to South America and the West Indies in 1948 and 1949. French West Africa and the Dominican Republic in 1958, and Liberia in 1961 for the New York Post. He was editor of the National News in 1932 and served as special assistant in publicity for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in 1934 and 1935. In 1952, the Lincoln University School of Journalism, in Jefferson City, Mo., awarded a certificate of merit to Schuyler. Schuyler, a resident of New York, is the author of "Black No More" and "Slaves Today.")

New York.—The current crop of anti-white disturbances, like those in the past, is the inevitable consequence of the increasing competition between rival civil rights groups led by career agitators vying for the profits of organized pandemonium. Never have so many innocent people been betrayed by so few for so little.

There are as many different kinds of Negroes as there are white people, and most of them deplore the bad reputation they have been given by the excesses of the agitational and criminal elements of their so-called race. They respect life and property. They own millions of homes, automobiles, and modern utensils and do not cram the jails.

Like their white counterparts, they are eager to live in peace. They have no illusions about the marching, mobbing, picketing, vandalizing Negro element. They know there is a lot of law in the end of a policeman's nightstick, and they want it used.

Above all, these Negroes wish white people in authority would stop flattering and encouraging the sorcerer's apprentices leading astray the mentally retarded and criminally bent black minority.

YOUNG INCITED

Utilizing the traditional techniques of "spontaneous" disorder, well known to Communists, Nazis, and other political perverts, the self-appointed leaders of the Negro revolution have for years recklessly incited young Negroes to mass action inside (and often outside) the urban Negro enclaves.

In turn they have denounced "police brutality," "the white power structure," "residential segregation," "de facto segregated schools," "job discrimination," "phony white liberals," and a whole gamut of grievances which could not possibly be solved or even ameliorated in a century, if then, and will never lessen racial conflict.

Constant suggestions of "a long hot summer" and "conditions getting worse before they get better," are but invitations to hoodlums, arsonists, and vandals aided by white beatnik amorality and malcontent leftists currently disturbing our carapaces.

Not a single one of these trumpeted evils is nonexistent here nor in any other country similarly circumstanced. They are products of our color caste system which will never be improved by Negro insurrection. They are in all multiracial and multiethnic societies from Soviet Muslim Asia to Central Africa.

UNITED STATES SITTING DUCK

These problems are more agitated here because the United States has been a sitting duck for leftwing moralizers who have made millions of well-meaning Americans feel like Nazi racists; and who have persuaded gullible Negroes into believing the only thing holding them back is persecution.

Only the most self-serving demagogues, arrogant know-it-alls, or men with social revolution in mind would stir up a social situation so fraught with tragedy for Negroes, or profess to believe that any predominant social class would willingly surrender power, prestige, and privileges in the face of threats and violent demonstrations.

Ever since the long and futile Montgomery bus boycott (settled not by marching but by Federal court order), the peripatetic Dr. Martin Luther King and his posse of political parsons in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) have roamed the country collecting coins and infecting the mentally retarded with the germs of civil disobedience, camouflaged as nonviolence and love of white people.

Phony prayers for the salvation of white oppressors and chanting slave songs fooled nobody except possibly the utopians and wishful thinkers. Only the unwary and true believers thought this program was anything but pixilated.

STAGE IS SET

As many Negroes foresaw, the net result of this long encouragement of civil disobedience, disdain for authority, and general disrespect for public morals, was to set the stage for the successive disgraceful orgies of burning, looting, vandalism, and death, with the criminal elements of the slum proletariat taking over. Ironically when police called upon these civil rights leaders to help control the rampaging mobs they were found completely ineffective.

With the recklessness of complete ignorance or irresponsibility, the SCLC sent its mobile gangs of young clergymen from place to place to take over the revolution despite expressed objections of local leaders, even mobilizing schoolchildren to face police clubs, dogs, and firehoses, breeding illwill and jeopardizing Negro jobs by promotion of nuisance tactics. No matter how many minions might be juggled by the police, the Reverend King always contrived to get out in time for his next speaking engagement.

James Farmer, the professional pacifist and war resister who heads the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) has played an even more sinister role with outright challenges to law, order and public peace. Like

SCLC, this outfit operates schools of subversion where graduates are trained in how to march on city halls and courthouses, fall limp when arrested, and in other ways make pests of themselves.

Not to be outdone by these competitors for the scarce civil rights dollar, the veteran National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) saw the expedience of adopting the same tactics of boycotts, sit-ins, marches and picketings. It even went much further by thinking up the de facto school segregation gimmick which has kept the North and East in an uproar for the last 3 years.

EMPTY ASSUMPTION

The empty assumption behind this campaign is that schools predominantly attended by Negro children are ipso facto segregated and therefore inferior; and that to equalize public education this "imbalance" must be corrected by moving the Negro children into predominantly "white" schools.

Since this was and is obviously impossible, what small victories have attended these herculean efforts have been pyrrhic. Nowhere have school boycotts, marches and besiegements of boards of education done else but worsen race relations.

The millionaire-subsidized National Urban League (NUL) stretched absurdity still further by coming out publicly for preference being shown Negroes in employment and promotion because they are so far behind whites. This was and is doomed to failure in our basically competitive society but it adds up to another "reason" for suspicion and hatred of white people.

All of these civil rights leaders have joined in a loud chorus denouncing "police brutality" or the forceful suppression in every large Negro community. Every subordinate from coast to coast joined in the hue and cry although decent Negroes as well as whites suffer from this criminal element.

CRY SOUNDS

The cry sounds in many cities, with monotonous regularity, for "civilian review boards" to help wreck discipline and restrain the police from doing what they are hired to do. This outcry has emboldened the Negro criminal element and lowered its respect for and fear of the police.

The respectable bulk of Negroes has been reduced to silence by the terrorism of the agitational element. Every Negro who has openly opposed its illegal and senseless actions has been denounced as an "Uncle Tom," an enemy of his people, and lackey of the whites.

One distinguished and authentic Negro leader, Rev. Dr. Joseph E. Jackson, president of the 5-million-strong National Baptist Convention (NBC) of America, Inc., was hoisted off the stand in Chicago stadium because he expressed views opposed to those of the professional agitators. The current president of the Philadelphia branch of the NAACP has had a field day denouncing the conservative middle-class Negroes in the organization.

Craven politicians have contributed much to this insurrectionary atmosphere by not standing up to the intellectual authors of violence and subversion. Consider the spectacle of New York's Mayor Robert F. Wagner skulking through the basement of New York's city hall rather than have thrown out the beatniks picketing his office; of other high officials permitting their work to be disrupted in the name of civil rights; of needed public construction being halted by CORE beatniks; of President Johnson being booed at the New York World's Fair. The "power structure" has been long-suffering but much too cooperative for its own good.

ONE-SIDED PRESENTATION

Most of the civil rights leaders who have sparked these insurrections would still be unknown if it had been for the mass communications media which publicized them

September 14, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

22943

of union funds is a shameful waste of the assets which the act seeks to protect.

"B. Surety companies authorized to issue bonds"

"Under rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 13(e) of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, as amended, the Secretary may approve bonding arrangements other than those with a surety company which is an acceptable surety on Federal bonds under authority granted by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the act of July 30, 1947 (6 U.S.C. 6-13)."

"Accepting the formula of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, the proposed legislation gives the Secretary of Labor the authority to exempt labor organizations from placing the bond required under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act through a surety company holding a grant of authority from the Treasury Department, when in his opinion, such labor organization 'has made other bonding arrangements which would provide the protection required.' Experience under the similar provisions of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, which were enacted in 1962, reveals that the Secretary has used this discretionary power most carefully and cautiously, thereby assuring to the union funds involved the utmost protection. He has granted an exemption to those labor organizations which make arrangements with the underwriters at Lloyd's, London, contingent on certain conditions which must be first met by Lloyd's. (See CFR secs. 465.17 and 465.18.)

"The proposed legislation also provides that such other bonding arrangements under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act must be at a cost which is comparable or less than that of securing the requisite bond from a surety company holding a grant of authority from the Treasury Department.

"It is not the intention of the committee, in giving this discretionary power to the Secretary, to sanction self-insurance on the part of labor organizations. Since the Secretary has recognized that the language of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act does not give him authority to recognize self-insurance as offering adequate protection to the union funds affected by that act, the committee is assured that self-insurance shall not be recognized as adequate protection under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act.

"However, it is the intention of the committee that both foreign and domestic surety companies, other than those holding a grant of authority from the Treasury Department, shall be eligible, upon prior consent of the Secretary of Labor, to issue the bonds required by the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act.

"C. Reporting"

"Following the basic concept of the reporting and disclosure requirements of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, the legislation proposes that each surety company which issues any bond required by either act shall file with the Secretary a report describing its bond experience under each such act. These reports shall be in such form and detail as the Secretary may prescribe by regulation, but shall include information as to the premiums received, total claims paid, amounts recovered by way of subrogation, administrative and legal expenses. By giving the Secretary discretion as to what information shall be required in these reports the committee feels that both the public interest and the policy of the acts can best be served."

SCENIC DEVELOPMENT AND ROAD BEAUTIFICATION OF FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY SYSTEMS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 2084.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2084) to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal aid Highway Systems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

PENALTIES FOR HANDLING AND COLLECTION OF DISHONORED CHECKS OR MONEY ORDERS

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives on the bill (S. 1317) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe penalties for the handling and collection of dishonored checks or money orders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1317) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe penalties for the handling and collection of dishonored checks or money orders, which were, on page 1, line 7, strike out "or money order"; on page 1, line 9, strike out "or money order"; on page 2, line 4, strike out "or money orders"; on page 2, line 7, strike out "or money order"; and to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe penalties for the handling and collection of dishonored checks."

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF PART II OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE RELATING TO DIVORCE, LEGAL SEPARATION, AND ANNULMENT OF MARRIAGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 948, which was read as follows:

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment numbered 1 of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 948) entitled "An Act to amend part II of the District of Columbia Code relating to divorce, legal separation, and annulment of marriage in the District of Columbia."

Resolved, That the House disagree to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 to aforesaid bill.

Resolved, That the House disagree to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 to aforesaid bill.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, the action by the Senate in receding to its amendment No. 3 is technical and more fully explanatory in nature, and does not alter that portion of the bill amending section 16-904(b) of the District of Columbia Code, providing that a judgment of legal separation from bed and board may be enlarged into a judgment of divorce from the bond of marriage upon application of the innocent party, a copy of which shall be duly served upon the adverse party, after the separation, which is intended to mean the legal separation, of the parties has been continued for 1 year next before the making of the application.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from the Senate amendments numbered two and three.

The motion was agreed to.

DESIGNATION OF FRANCIS CASE MEMORIAL BRIDGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 5) designating the bridge crossing the Washington Channel near the intersection of the extension of 13th and G Streets Southwest the "Francis Case Memorial Bridge," which were, to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the bridge crossing the Washington Channel of the Potomac River on Interstate Route 95, approximately one hundred yards downstream from the outlet gate of the Tidal Basin, near the intersection of the extension of Thirteenth and G Streets Southwest, shall be known and designated as the "Francis Case Memorial Bridge". Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States or of the District of Columbia in which such bridge is referred to shall be held to refer to such bridge as the "Francis Case Memorial Bridge".

SEC. 2. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall place on the "Francis Case Memorial Bridge" plaques of suitable and appropriate design.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit copies of this resolution to the wife of the late Senator Francis Case, Myrie Case; his daughter, Jane Case Williams; and his granddaughters, Catherine and Julia.

And to insert the following preamble:

Whereas the Congress and the citizens of the District of Columbia are sorely saddened by the tragic and untimely passing of one of the District's most dedicated and resourceful friends, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, Francis Case; and

Whereas during his long and distinguished career in the United States House of Representative and the United States Senate, Francis Case was known and respected for his courage and untiring devotion to duty, and was loved for his sincerity, modesty, and understanding; and

Whereas he attained enviable stature and esteem for his constant cooperation, his wise counsel, and his broad comprehension of planning and development in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas Francis Case was an architect of the twenty-third amendment to the Constitution of the United States guaranteeing residents of the District of Columbia the right to vote for electors for President and Vice President; and

Whereas during his years of service Francis Case sponsored many measures for improve-

22944

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 14, 1965

ments in the District of Columbia and served as chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia in 1953 and 1954; and

Whereas, through diligent study of past, present, and future District of Columbia needs, Francis Case gained a thorough grasp of District activities and helped fashion firm policies that will guide the District for decades; and

Whereas, after having served on the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia through the years 1951 to 1954, Francis Case returned voluntarily to the committee in 1959 and 1960 to serve again the people of the District despite his increased responsibilities in the United States Senate; and

Whereas his able and dedicated service as a member of the Senate Committee on Public Works contributed immeasurably to the development and improvement of the highway transportation system in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas it was through this remarkable dedication to duty that Francis Case helped bring about major District of Columbia expansion of highway and bridge construction, through the enactment of the District of Columbia public works program in 1954, that is a lasting monument to his service: Now, therefore, be it

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, the amendments of the House are acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

SPRUCE KNOB-SENECA ROCKS NATIONAL RECREATION AREA, WEST VIRGINIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 7) to provide for the establishment of the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area, in the State of West Virginia, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in order to provide for the public outdoor recreation use and enjoyment thereof by the people of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area in the State of West Virginia.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the "Secretary") shall—

(1) designate as soon as practicable after this Act takes effect the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area within and adjacent to, and as a part of, the Monongahela National Forest in West Virginia, not to exceed in the aggregate one hundred thousand acres comprised of the area including Spruce Knob, Smoke Hole, and Seneca Rock, and lying primarily in the drainage of the South Branch of the Potomac River, the boundaries of which shall be those shown on the map entitled "Proposed Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area", dated March 1965, which is on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; and

(2) publish notice of the designation in the Federal Register, together with a map showing the boundaries of the recreation area.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary shall acquire by purchase with donated or appropriated funds, by gift, exchange, condemnation, transfer from any Federal agency, or otherwise, such lands, waters, or interests therein within the boundaries of the recreation area as he determines to be needed or desirable for the purposes of this Act. For the purposes of section 6 of the Act of September 3, 1964 (78 Stat. 897, 903), the boundaries of

the Monongahela National Forest, as designated by the Secretary pursuant to section 2 of this Act, shall be treated as if they were the boundaries of that forest on January 1, 1965. Lands, waters, or interests therein owned by the State of West Virginia or any political subdivision of that State may be acquired only with the concurrence of such owner.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Federal property located within the boundaries of the recreation area may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred without consideration to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for use by him in implementing the purposes of this Act.

(c) In exercising his authority to acquire lands by exchange the Secretary may accept title to non-Federal property within the recreation area and convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property in the State of West Virginia under his jurisdiction.

(d) The portion of the moneys paid to the State of West Virginia under the provisions of section 13 of the Act of March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U.S.C. 500), for expenditure for the benefit of Pendleton and Grant Counties, West Virginia, may be expended as the State legislature may prescribe for the benefit of such counties for public schools, public roads, or other public purposes.

SEC. 4. (a) After the Secretary acquires an acreage within the area designated pursuant to paragraph (1) of section 2 of this Act that is in his opinion efficiently administrable to carry out the purposes of this Act, he shall institute an accelerated program of development of facilities for outdoor recreation. Said facilities shall be so devised to take advantage of the topography and geographical location of the lands in relation to the growing recreation needs of the people of the United States.

(b) The Secretary may cooperate with all Federal and State authorities and agencies that have programs which will hasten completion of the recreation area and render services which will aid him in evaluating and effectuating the establishment of adequate summer and winter outdoor recreation facilities.

SEC. 5. The administration, protection, and development of the recreation area shall be by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the laws, rules, and regulations applicable to national forests, in such manner as in his judgment will best provide for (1) public outdoor recreation benefits; (2) conservation of scenic, scientific, historic, and other values contributing to public enjoyment; and (3) such management, utilization, and disposal of natural resources as in his judgment will promote, or is compatible with, and does not significantly impair the purposes for which the recreation area is established.

SEC. 6. The Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing on lands and waters under his jurisdiction within the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area in accordance with applicable Federal and State laws. The Secretary may designate zones where, and establish periods when, no hunting shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, or public use and enjoyment, and shall issue regulations after consultation with the Department of Natural Resources of the State of West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, S. 7 passed the Senate earlier this year. Recently, it passed the House of Representatives with two minor amendments. These amendments were

suggested by the public officials of Grant and Pendleton Counties in West Virginia, the two counties in which the national recreation area would be established. Specifically, the amendments deal with the acreage and with the disposition of national forest revenues in the two counties involved.

The amendments had the approval of the U.S. Forest Service. This being the case, I have cleared the matter with the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and also with the ranking minority member on that committee, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I have also cleared it with the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader.

Therefore, in order that the Senate may not have to have a conference with the House of Representatives, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

THE IMMIGRATION BILL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, one of the major issues yet to come before the Senate, before adjournment this year, is the proposed revision of the U.S. immigration laws. The subject of immigration has appeared on most of the lists of "must" legislation I have seen in recent weeks. The President has made several statements stressing its importance.

The national origins concept, which underlies the present system, was first proposed on April 11, 1924, and was based on the national origins of the inhabitants of the United States according to the 1920 census, exclusive of, first, natives of independent countries of the Western Hemisphere, second, persons of Asian ancestry, third, descendants of African immigrants, and fourth, descendants of American aborigines. The proposal was voted down in the House of Representatives, but it was inserted in the Senate and retained in conference. The Senate and House agreed to the conference report, and the bill, as amended, became law on May 26, 1924. The original objective of the 1924 act was to maintain the ethnic composition of the American people, on the premise that some nations are far closer to the United States in culture, customs, standards of living, respect for law, and experience in self-government. The act was denounced by some people as racially biased, statistically incorrect, and a clumsy instrument of selection based on discrimination against nations.

In 1952, the Immigration and Nationality Act was passed, this legislation being a codification of a multitude of laws governing immigration and naturalization in the United States. The immigration quotas provided therein were, in general, patterned after the national origins system, contained in the Immigration Act of 1924, in that the number of quota immigrants entering the United States during any one year was limited and a distribution of the annual quota among the various quota areas was provided. The national ori-

September 14, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

22945

gins provision was the subject of debate in both Houses of the Congress. President Truman vetoed the bill but, notwithstanding his strong opposition, the President's veto was overridden by the Congress and the Immigration and Naturalization Act became law.

I have only two objections to the present system. One is that it applies no limitation on immigration from South America and other Western Hemisphere countries and, theoretically, any number of persons could emigrate to the United States from the Western Hemisphere countries immediately. This weakness has not had too great an impact upon our country up to the present moment, largely because South American countries have been absorbing their own population increase very well. Yet, the day is not far off, when the population explosion in Latin American countries will exert great pressures upon those people to emigrate to the United States. It will be my intention, therefore, to support a limitation on the number of immigrants from Western Hemisphere countries, but I fear that such a limitation, if it is retained in the Senate bill, may be scrapped in the subsequent conference with the House of Representatives. My other objection is that under the present system, certain countries, such as Italy and Greece, for example, whose peoples do assimilate readily and easily into the American society, have been disadvantaged.

Notwithstanding the two objections I have iterated, I think the basic national origins quota system should be retained. I realize that it has been nullified to a great extent by amendments and special refugee laws and other legislation in the form of private bills. The system has been castigated and vilified by those who declare that it discriminates against other nations, but, on the whole, I consider it to be a just and wise system. Relatively larger quotas, of course, are assigned to such countries as England, Scotland, Ireland, Germany, France, and Scandinavia, but this is because the basic population of our country is made up largely of stocks which originated from those countries, and the reasoning back of the present system is that additional population from those countries would be more easily and readily assimilated into the American population. Naturally, those immigrants can best be absorbed into our modern population whose backgrounds and cultures are similar. It is indubitably clear that if the majority of Americans had sprung, not from Western, central, and southern Europe, but from central Africa or southern Asia, we would today have a vastly different country. Unquestionably, there are fine human beings in all parts of the world, but people do differ widely in their social habits, their levels of ambition, their mechanical aptitudes, their inherited ability and intelligence, their moral traditions, and their capacities for maintaining stable governments.

The advocates of this legislation state that the increase in immigration brought about by its passage will be minuscule and will amount to only a few additional thousand persons annually, but I fear

that the practical result will be otherwise. In my judgment, it is completely unrealistic for us to be considering legislation that is going to permanently increase our immigration to any degree whatsoever. I grant that the immigrants who have come to this country have made a magnificent contribution to our development. Anyone who attempts to articulate this contribution is doomed to understatement because, certainly, this Nation was put together by immigrants and would not exist if they had not come here.

It is true also that immigrants have continued to play an important role in our Nation's development. But that role has been and is dwindling in importance. Most of us are descendants of immigrants, but this is no longer a nation that needs immigration as it once did. Indeed, the problems we will face in the years ahead will be those of a surplus population rather than needed population. In this respect we are like most other nations of the world. But, unlike other nations, we have not yet learned how to give primary consideration to immigration as it will affect us internally, without developing a guilty conscience. We have yet to make the philosophical transition from an immigrant-seeking nation, which we were until fairly recently, to one whose population has developed to the capabilities of our present resources.

But why, Mr. President, should the United States be the only advanced nation in the world today to develop a guilt complex concerning its immigration policies, when it is already far more liberal than other countries in this respect, and in view of the fact that other advanced nations are selective in dealing with immigrants and without apology?

Every other country that is attractive to immigrants practices selectivity and without apology. For example, Trinidad is an island country that gained its independence from Great Britain a few years ago. Yet, under a new British law, immigration from Trinidad is closely restricted. Australia has no quota at all. It simply excludes anyone of non-European ancestry. I am told that the Japanese Government discourages immigration from many countries. I am also informed that Israel has a policy—as it has every right to have—based on religion. Why should the United States, therefore, not reflect careful selectivity and be more restrictive in the formulation of its immigration policies?

Our first responsibility in matters of immigration, at a time when automation is on the rise and the population explosion is giving cause for concern, is to the people of the United States and not to the entire population of the world.

The advocates of change assure us that under the proposed legislation it will be easier for people of special skills to come into the country and help the U.S. economy. Yet, under the new legislation, there would be an increase in quotas for such countries, as Trinidad, Jamaica, Tanzania, Malawi, Yemen, and Nepal, and I would imagine that persons with special skills needed in the United States might

be very hard to find in those countries. Moreover, under existing law, skilled aliens are granted first preference status which entitles them to monopolize the first 50 percent of a country's quota. Yet, we continue to hear general platitudes about attracting skilled workers.

A collateral question that arises is whether we really want or need to permanently attract skilled workers away from other countries. This policy seems at odds with our other efforts to help these countries improve their economic conditions. It seems to me that these countries need the services of their talented and trained people more than we do.

I think it is rather inconsistent on our part, Mr. President, to permit an increase in immigration—which is sure to be the effect of a more lenient immigration statute—at a time when we are becoming more and more aware of the population problems we are faced with in the world and in this country. These problems are bound to increase in dimension in the years ahead. The continent with the highest birth rate in the world today is South America. Yet, under our present immigration laws, unlimited immigration is allowed to natives of Central and South American countries. It is time we were looking to this aspect of our immigration policy with a view to applying restrictions rather than trying to rectify discriminations against Asian and African countries that exist in our quota system. As I said earlier, I intend to support the application of a limitation on immigration from Western Hemispheric countries, but any change in our present immigration laws should be largely limited to just this aspect and should not encompass such a wholesale revision as that with which we are about to be faced.

Sooner or later, it seems to me, we are going to have to recognize the realities of this situation and to admit to ourselves that our first responsibility in matters of immigration is to the people of the United States and not to the entire population of the world. If we think that we are going to be able to alleviate the problems of expanding population of other countries of the world by permitting increased immigration into this country we have some more hard thinking to do on the subject. It would be completely unrealistic for us to attempt to do this when the current annual net increase in world population is 70 million people, or more than one-third of the present population of the United States. The plain fact is that the United States is not hurting for population or jobseekers. Our population is now between 190 and 200 million people, and our current birth rate is far in excess of our death rate.

The problems we face due to expanding population may not presently be as serious as those faced by other countries of the world. Our agricultural and other productive capacities have not yet been put to the test. But we are now experiencing a number of troubles which are directly or indirectly attributable to our increasing population. These include pollution of our rivers and streams,

22946

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 14, 1965

and the air we breathe in our great metropolitan areas; the first serious water shortages in the northeastern part of the country; progressive extinction of wildlife; and ever-increasing welfare costs as the nonproductive segments of our population continue to expand. A good deal of the legislation we have enacted in recent years has been directed toward finding solutions to these problems. Liberalizing our immigration policies cannot help but compound such problems.

In my opinion, revising our immigration laws by removing the Asia-Pacific triangle provisions will add to the many social problems that now confront us across the Nation. What effect will all the "new seed" immigrants that will be allowed to enter under the bill have upon these social crises? I doubt that they will add stability to our population in meeting these problems.

Moreover, the crime rate is increasing alarmingly in our urban centers. The great bulk of immigrants in recent years have settled in these metropolitan areas. I would not claim that, generally speaking, immigrants as a class are especially prone to criminal conduct, but I should think that their increased migration into the cities would add to the problems that are already there.

Another point raised by those who would have us scrap the national origins quota system is that a new system of selection will be devised which will be in the national interest. In other words, they would have us believe that our foreign policy will be ineffective and hampered if we retain the national origins quota system. This is pure drivel. Why have other advanced nations not felt it in the interest of their own foreign policies to let down their immigration bars? The plain fact is that there will always be cries of rage from people who would like to get into this country and cannot. One can live more comfortably on relief in a New York tenement than under the most advantageous conditions existing in most of the areas of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

We are also told that the proposed new immigration legislation is needed to reunite families. But the Congress of the United States has always been sympathetic to requests for entry of separated families. As to Italians, Lebanese, and other immigrants who wish to unite with their families already here, I have personally introduced legislation many times to reunite husbands and their wives, and parents and their children, and I shall continue to do so as the necessity arises. I believe that this system is workable and should be continued.

But, Mr. President, if we scuttle the national origins quota system, we will have many years and many reasons to regret it. I do not claim that the existing national origins quota system is perfect, but it has provided a reasonably effective means of controlling immigration, and where it has not worked, we have enacted special legislation to alleviate special problems as they have arisen.

The national interest must come first. Sentimental slogans have been all too

adroitly exploited, and the time is at hand when we must resist the pressures for sharply increased immigration of persons with cultures, customs, and concepts of government altogether at variance with those of the basic American stocks. We must not throw open the gates to areas whose peoples would be undeniably more difficult for our population to assimilate and convert into patriotic Americans. The alien inflow to America from potential waiting lists of applicants from Jamaica, Trinidad, Tobago, Indonesia, India, Nigeria, and so forth, can profoundly affect the character of the American population, and, in the long run, can critically influence our concepts of government.

In my capacity as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I review, with other members of the committee, budgetary requirements for operations of various Federal departments and agencies. I feel it expedient that we consider the necessity of funding administrative costs arising from processing and admitting the increased number of immigrants which will certainly result from the enactment of the proposed legislation.

I ask also where the medical specialists are coming from, both here and abroad, to efficiently screen the state of physical and/or mental health of various immigrant applicants who are anticipated as being admissible under the changed wording of the areas of this bill dealing with physical and/or mental health and past history of mental illness? Any person who has ever reviewed court testimony by experts in the field of mental problems, mental health, mental capability to judge moral or legal responsibility, mental capacity for safe driving, and related problems, will well wonder what Pandora's box we may be opening.

I am advised that the term "mentally retarded" will be substituted for the term "feeble-minded" in the exclusion of aliens who are feeble-minded to conform to current American usage as in the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act of 1963—Public Law 83-164—and the Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963—Public Law 88-156. This may be a simple change in nomenclature, Mr. President, but its implications can be very significant. In the United States today, there are approximately 5 million persons in the largest group of mentally retarded, who, I am told, cannot usually be distinguished from the remainder of the population until they have difficulty in learning school subjects. To quote from President Kennedy's Panel on Mental Retardation in 1962:

Without special attention, they often become the problem members of our society, capable only of a marginal productive role. They are the workers who are the most frequently displaced by the economic adjustments in our competitive society. However, given timely supervision, guidance and training early enough in life, many will be capable of complete assimilation into our society.

It is readily apparent, Mr. President, that under the proposed alteration in verbiage, we will facilitate the immigration of persons into our country who, to

quote the 1962 panel, "often become the problem members of our society, capable only of a marginal productive role."

Of course, we are told that developments in the field of mental health are such that, with careful supervision, those mentally retarded persons admitted under the new immigration concept will be capable of assimilation into our society. The advocates of the proposed legislation assure us that the services necessary for the retarded immigrant child or adult will be provided without his becoming a public charge. But, Mr. President, I fear that the assurances of proper safeguards will not work out in actual practice as they are envisioned to do so in theory. It seems to me that we are making a serious mistake if we enact legislation which will result in adding to our already increasing burden of costs and care in the field of mental health, those immigrants who have histories of some form of mental illness. We must not overlook the fact that each young immigrant afflicted with some form of mental illness or retardation is a potential parent of children who may inherit the same mental defects.

With reference to physical health, Mr. President, anyone who has traveled very broadly throughout the world can certainly find himself, or herself, wondering whether the very vocal advocates of an open door to the promise of America truly realize what the destruction of our present national origins quota system and the elimination of the Asia-Pacific triangle provisions may involve. As one example, Japan with its teeming millions, has so polluted its coastal waters that infectious hepatitis is indigenous to that area to such an extent that persons are warned against swimming in the waters, from drinking the water, from eating the seafood until it has been completely treated with heat, or otherwise, to destroy bacteria. And still the disease spreads. Recent newspaper photographs showed beaches in Japan, during a late summer hot spell, literally covered with human beings for miles of shoreline. The intense overpopulation has so increased the dangers of spreads of infections that it is not an uncommon sight to walk down Japanese streets, to ride street cars, to travel in trains, and see numbers of Japanese wearing gauze surgical masks as a primary means of reducing the dangers of epidemics.

I am not critical of the Japanese, nor of the Indians, for their overpopulation problem. I am truly sympathetic with them. But, even more important, I am concerned with the fact that these nations are now at a point where we in the United States are heading—and one only has to pick up our census reports and prognostications to learn this.

There are, of course, persons who sincerely believe that, because there has been some stabilization of applications for admissions to the United States, over the past several years, under our national origins quotas, there will be but a minute increase in applications for immigration into the United States, as a result of these proposed amendments.

However, the facts of our present immigration laws, and the policies under

September 14, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

22947

which they operate, are well known throughout the world and have for decades served as deterrents to many potential immigrants in their efforts to enter the United States.

The passage of the proposed legislation will remove these deterrents, and, in view of the fact that many northern European nations, under the present system, have unused quotas, I fear that the practical results of the new legislation will be a considerably increased immigration, in addition to the many serious concomitant problems, some of which I have discussed.

We take justifiable pride in the heritage of the American melting pot, but, unless the national origins quota system is maintained and unless limitations are placed on immigration from Western Hemispheric countries, the melting pot will no longer melt, and eventually ours will become a conglomerate, characterless society.

I believe deeply that we owe future generations the simple service of preserving the American heritage with its traditional social and political customs, its culture, and its national characteristics. Our national immigration policy must be an immigration policy that is in the national interest, and it must aim to establish the proper relationships between immigration and employment as well as between immigration and stable government.

Every 7½ seconds the clock in the U.S. Department of Commerce building in Washington records a new birth. Every 17 seconds one person dies in the United States. A foreign national enters the country every 90 seconds, and an immigrant leaves every 23 minutes. This all adds up to a net gain, I am told, of one every 12 seconds, which means a net annual increase of about 2.6 million. It is time that we awaken ourselves to the fact that future generations have no one to look to but ourselves for the preservation of the Nation, of liberty, freedom, and opportunity, and a republican form of government. Therefore, I intend to cast my vote, when the moment comes, against the proposal to scrap the national origins quota system because the proposed legislation will permit a greater inflow of immigrants from Asian and African countries and because our own problems of chronic and persistent unemployment and underemployment, housing, job retraining needs, growing welfare caseloads, crime, and juvenile delinquency are so great that we should not be considering any liberalization of the immigration laws.

I recognize that this is a very delicate issue and that the position I have taken will not be popular with some people, particularly those who misunderstand my reasons therefor. Nonetheless, I feel it my duty to vote against the proposed legislation, in my judgment, it not being in the best interests of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point in my remarks an article entitled "The Situation as U.S. Population Nears 200 Million," published in the Washington Sunday Star of September 5, 1965.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE SITUATION AS U.S. POPULATION NEARS 200 MILLION

Anyone contemplating a big celebration for the day when the U.S. population reaches 200 million should start planning fairly soon. According to the Population Reference Bureau, there are only about 21 months to go.

The 195 million mark was reached this month. At the present rate of growth the next 5 million needed to top 200 million would be added about May 1967.

Currently, the population is growing by about 7,200 a day, requiring some 700 days to accumulate a 5 million increase. The first census in 1790 enumerated 3.9 million persons. For two decades thereafter the Nation's growth averaged only about 450 persons a day, requiring 30 years to add 5 million. The birth rate around 1790 was more than twice as high as it is now. However, today's larger population base of 195 million can roll up a 5 million increase much faster than a base of 3.9 million.

Once a country's population passes the 100 million mark, even a moderate fertility rate produces a sizable numerical increase. India's population, for example, is increasing by 5 million every 150 days. If India suddenly cut both her birth rate and death rate in half, making them roughly equal to the U.S. rate (21.2 births and 9.4 deaths per 1,000 population), her population would still increase at well over 5 million a year. This is what comes of having a population of nearly half a billion. If population growth in the United States continues at the present rate, in just over 60 years this Nation will have as many people as India has today.

Japan, to take another example, has cut her birth rate to among the lowest in the world, 17.2. With a population just under 100 million, Japan will still realize a 5 million increase in 5½ years. In Canada, on the other hand, where the population is less than 20 million, it would take over 10 years at the current rate of growth to reach a total of 25 million.

U.S. RATE DECLINED

Around 1800, when the U.S. birth rate was over 50, the annual population increase was about 165,000. Today, with a moderate birth rate of 21.2, the increase is over 2.6 million each year.

The uncertainty of the family size preferences of upcoming parents makes the future of U.S. population growth difficult to predict. During the post-World War II baby boom, the U.S. birth rate reached 26.6 in 1947—the highest since 1921. Although the rate has declined somewhat in recent years, the population gain for the intercensal decade (1950-60) was an unprecedented 28 million—almost identical to the 28.5 million increase for the 20-year period, 1930-50.

While the birth rate has gone down since 1957 and shows no signs of leveling off, the rising tide of young women just entering the high-fertility age group, 20-29, is expected to make an impression on the total fertility of the Nation.

"The 195-million mark in August may become a turning point in U.S. population growth," according to Robert C. Cook, president of the Population Reference Bureau.

"In view of the very large fertility potential which now confronts us, the decades immediately ahead must be viewed as crucial ones," said Cook. "Even with a leveling off of the birth rate, we will be adding nearly 8 million a year to our population. If present trends continue, we will reach a growth level of 5 million a year during the last decade of the century." The highest projection of the Bureau of the Census, based on a return to the high-fertility rates of the

postwar years, shows the U.S. population increasing by 7.5 million per year between 2000 and 2010.

DEPENDENT AGE GROUPS

At present, American parents of a newborn baby can expect their child to live past the age of 70. In 1900, life expectancy at birth was less than 50 years. The population aged 65 and over has increased by almost 500 percent since 1900, from 3 million to nearly 18 million. The number of children under 19 has risen from 34 million in 1900 to 77 million today.

The median age of the population is now 28.5 years and could drop to 25 years if U.S. fertility reverts to the postwar pattern. Thus, over half the population is in the dependent age groups of under 19 and over 65.

"Urban concentration is adding to the problems created by this socially demanding age structure," Cook said. "Over 70 percent of all Americans live in cities. Already we are nationally distraught by the perplexing problems of urban congestion, water shortage, juvenile crime, chronic deficiency in educational facilities, and inadequate care of the aged.

"Those who think growth to 195 million Americans should be celebrated with noisemakers and paper hats might well prepare their children to celebrate the 400-million mark with padded personal water bottles and oxygen masks."

SCENIC DEVELOPMENT AND ROAD BEAUTIFICATION OF THE FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY SYSTEMS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2084) to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal aid highway systems.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, today the majority leader announced that tomorrow the Senate would begin the consideration of S. 2084, known as the highway beautification bill. I serve on the Committee on Public Works and voted to report the bill to the Senate.

In committee, I offered several amendments to the bill. Some were adopted, and I hope they will be maintained by the Senate. Other amendments that I offered were rejected and I expect to offer them on the floor of the Senate.

I strongly supported the first bill considered by Congress with respect to the beautification of highways. That was a bill that was introduced in the administration of President Eisenhower and provided for the control of advertising on the Interstate Highway System. The bill was strongly contested, but was passed by Congress.

In 1961 and again in 1963 I joined the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] in introducing bills to extend that act. Against strong opposition, our bills were approved by Congress.

The bill that will be considered tomorrow differs from the bill which was enacted in 1958 providing for the control of advertising on the Interstate Highway System. S. 2084, in title 1, would provide for Federal control of signs and billboards located in areas adjacent to both the interstate and primary highway systems within 660 feet of the nearest edge of the highway.

Title 2 provides for the screening or removal of junkyards located in areas

22948

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 14, 1965

within 1,000 feet of the nearest edge of the right-of-way.

Title 3 provides for the landscaping and the scenic enhancement of all Federal-aid highways.

The bill introduced on behalf of the administration provided that the cost of the program, with the exception of title 3, was to be borne by the Federal Government and the States from general appropriations in the same proportion as is now applicable to the construction of the two systems; that is, 90 percent by the Federal Government and 10 percent by the States with respect to the Interstate System, and 50 percent by the Federal Government and 50 percent by the States with respect to the primary system.

The full cost of title 3 for the landscaping and scenic enhancement of all Federal-aid roads would be borne wholly by the Federal Government.

The amounts authorized to be appropriated in the bill would be, for the Federal Government, \$160 million for fiscal year 1966, \$160 million for fiscal year 1967, and \$40 million by the States in fiscal year 1966, and \$40 million by the States in fiscal year 1967, or a total Federal cost of \$320 million. This was admitted to be merely an estimate; the total cost of the entire program is speculative.

The bill would require that the States, through their legislatures, accept this program, if it should be enacted by Congress, by January 1, 1968. If the States did not accept the program, then all Federal funds, including matching funds, either for the Interstate Highway System, the primary system, the secondary system, or the urban system, would be denied the States, and these funds could be reapportioned among the complying States. I point this out because, worthy as the objectives of the bill are, the program is essentially mandatory upon the States. It requires them to accept the plan and also requires their legislatures to appropriate the money to pay the States' part of the program.

In committee, I offered several amendments. As I said, some of them were adopted. Today I wish to submit two amendments. The first amendment that I send to the desk would provide that the Federal Government pay the entire cost of the program. In the subcommittee, my amendment was adopted; but in the full committee, the action of the subcommittee was reversed. I should like to state briefly the reasons which led me to offer the amendment, and which will lead me to offer it tomorrow in the Senate.

First, this is a national program. It is so announced in the bill. It has been proclaimed by the President—and I think correctly so—that it is national in its scope. I think it should be considered as a national bill with the full cost to be paid by the Federal Government.

My second reason is that I believe this is the first bill of its type, that has been introduced in Congress, at least during my stay here. Dozens of Federal-aid programs are actually in existence. They are voluntary programs in the sense that the State must accept them

generally. The reasons for acceptance are strong, the States do accept them, and their legislatures provide the funds for the States share of the cost.

However, I do not consider this bill to be based on voluntary compliance—that is, one which the States can accept voluntarily.

It is declared that this is a national program; that the beautification of the highways is essential; and that the program should be accepted by Congress and then by the States. It may be argued that it is a voluntary program so far as the States are concerned, because the State legislatures must act to accept it. But I point out that the penalty—the denial of all highway funds to a State—does not give the States a chance to make voluntary decisions. It is, in effect, coercive, because no State could refuse to accept the program, and no State legislature could refuse to appropriate the money to pay its share of the cost; otherwise, the State would lose its entire apportionment for the construction of all Federal and State roads within its jurisdiction.

The chief reason that I believe the full cost should be paid by the Federal Government is the unusual character of the pending bill and the precedent that it could set if Congress were to declare that a program—perhaps one not as worthy as this—is essential to the national interest, and then, after enactment, require the States, pursuant to penalty, to accept the program and to appropriate money to pay for what in actuality is a Federal program. I believe we would be establishing an unusual precedent.

With all the dozens of Federal aid programs, I do not know of any other program in which a State is compelled to accept the program and to appropriate money for its share because of the penalty that would be imposed upon the State.

It might be said that we represent the States and that, therefore, we are adopting this program for the States. However, we cannot place ourselves in the position of substituting for State legislatures. I do not believe, as a matter of precedent, that we should impose upon the States this tremendous penalty which, in effect, would force them to accept this program.

I shall offer my amendment again tomorrow to require the Federal Government to pay the full cost of this program. I offered in the subcommittee another amendment which would extend the time for the removal of advertising and the screening of junkyards from 1970 to 1972.

I have noted in some articles that this has been termed an amendment to postpone the effective date of the highway beautification program. Of course, if one had read the bill, he would know that conclusion is not correct. The effective date for controls of advertising and the screening of junkyard's remains the same—January 1, 1968. When the States act—and they are compelled to act under this bill on or before that date—this program of control would go into effect immediately.

My amendment would simply extend the time for the removal of the advertising and the screening of the junkyards for 2 years. I believe that we would have certain advantages by so doing. First, it would actually only extend the time only 2 years because if a legislature acts in 1966, as it could, 6 years would be provided for the removal of advertising or for the screening of junkyards. If a legislature were to act in 1967, there would be 5 years.

If this cost were to be placed in part upon the States—and the cost is speculative—it would simply give the States an additional 2 years in which to distribute the cost of the burden.

If my amendment should be agreed to, thus placing the entire cost on the Federal Government, we would give the Federal Government 2 years in which to distribute the cost of the entire program.

Considering the state of the deficit of the Federal Government and the state of the budgets of many States, I should think that this would be helpful to both State and Federal Governments.

Another reason for offering my amendment is that it has been stated by members of our staff—and it has been confirmed by representatives of the Department of Commerce—that a great deal of this type of outdoor advertising is based on a 5-year lease.

If my amendment should be agreed to, an additional number of contracts would expire and which would reduce the total final cost of the program.

I offered a third amendment in committee. It was rejected both in the subcommittee and in the full committee. However, I shall offer it again.

This amendment would provide that the same standards be maintained which were accepted by Congress when the Interstate Highway System was enacted. The bill before us is much less restrictive in its standards than the standards Congress adopted for the Interstate Highway System.

There may be some reason—and I understand that there are reasons—for making the requirements less stringent upon the primary system. The primary system has been in the course of development since 1921. It comprises approximately 225,000 miles of road, running through thousands of communities, in which the advertising, thus far, at least, has not been prohibited by any act of the Federal Government. It has been subject only to the zoning powers and the police powers of the State. These controls upon the primary system, taking into account its mileage and the passage of the roads through thousands of communities, and the establishment of advertising as a legitimate business should be less restrictive. However, I see no reason for the open end provision in this bill applying to the Interstate Highway System. I believe that it should be made clear that, under this bill, the States—and of course they act through their municipalities—can zone additional commercial areas along the interstate system.

With respect to the Interstate Highway System, this would mean that along this 41,000 miles of road, running mostly

nist diplomatic officials who have defected to the West that, and I quote: "the headquarters of * * * the United Nations are centers of Communist espionage activity." This appears in House Document 119, free upon request.

Perhaps, to progress, you have heard rumors about a U.N. agency known as UNESCO—United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. Whatever you may have heard, if it's bad—it's true. UNESCO is probably the most insidious of the U.N.'s proliferous specialized agencies. This is the agency which is right now attacking you through the minds of your own children. Hard to believe? Shouldn't be. Despite the almost total control of news media in America, the facts have been made a part of the public record, for you to use. These are provable facts, just as are the 14 Index Nine Citations earned by only 4 of the people who prepared the first draft of the U.N. Charter. It is a widely known tenet of world communism, and a true one, that the subversion of only one generation will result in the victory of communism over freedom. Ladies and gentlemen, UNESCO is attempting that subversion right now. Paul Harvey summarized UNESCO very well when he said: "American children are being indoctrinated to live under one world government while Russian children are being taught to run that world government."

Hard to swallow? Just write to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in Washington, and ask for information on the U.N., UNESCO, and UNICEF. You'll receive a small assortment of pamphlets containing what they apparently must feel is mild propaganda. If these pamphlets are mild, I would certainly like to see some of the material they withdrew from circulation as obsolete 3 years ago.

Let me quote a bit. This is from one entitled, "Do You Know the Facts About UNESCO and UNICEF?" "From time to time, doubts and questions are raised about UNESCO and UNICEF. Long laid to rest, they still reappear, and others—some so irresponsible as to be called misrepresentations—spring up. Here, briefly, are the misstatements, answered by the facts. (Statement) UNESCO literature is slanted away from the traditions of the United States and toward a nebulous one-world government. The facts: Since its creation in 1946, UNESCO has published millions of pages of literature, out of which only two pamphlets discuss world citizenship but do not promote world government in any way. (Statement) UNESCO seeks to indoctrinate American school children with ideas contrary to American ideals and traditions, and seeks to influence teachers by placing materials and texts in the classrooms of America. The facts: UNESCO publishes only a limited amount of material suitable for classroom use, and supports this production only at the request of member states. The United States has never requested such assistance, and there is no known instance of schools using UNESCO books and manuals in this country."

Oddly enough, I have no intention of refuting the body of either contention, because they are both true—as far as they go. I will, however, attack both U.N. statements on the grounds of incompleteness. Point No. 1: The U.N. does publish only a limited amount of material suitable for classroom use. However, such alternative and external sources as The National Education Association's Committee on International Relations, the American Association for the U.N., Stanbow Productions, U.S. Committee for the U.N., World Publishing Co., Doubleday & Co., Fisher and Rabe Plays, Inc., Franklin Watts Co., E. P. Dutton & Co., Oceana Publications, and numerous others, make it unnecessary for the U.N. to engage in large scale publication of textbooks.

In point of fact, it is not UNESCO materials which are being used in our schools, but privately produced materials which accomplish the same goals. And, if you doubt the efficient job this material is doing on our children, just consider two—only two—facts. (1) The increasingly restricted amount of patriotic materials used in our schools. (2) The same kids who are rioting on college campuses, tearing up their draft cards rather than fight for imperialism and practicing (unsanitarily at that) free love to the accompaniment of filthy speech—these are the same kids who have matured during the period of U.N. existence. Point No. 2: The UNESCO published material does not promote world government per se, because the private productions are doing it for them.

There is another pamphlet, entitled "The World in Your Classroom—Suggestions for Teachers for U.N. projects." It covers elementary, intermediate, and high school grades. It suggests for elementary grades: "A classroom scrapbook project on the U.N." "A play or skit, emphasizing cooperation." (and I assume that includes the commies) "Study of the customs and life of children in other lands." Now, this is not the all encompassing Geography which we studied, but the study of foreign customs to the exclusion of our own national traditions. "Discussion of How UNICEF benefits other countries." Not discussion of the U.S. "CARE" program, nor how America benefits other countries, but UNICEF. "Class participation in the 'Trick or Treat for UNICEF' project. And, the best one of all, which I quote verbatim: "When your class talks about health, food, aviation, farming, and other topics, explain the work of the people at the United Nations in these fields. Use the stories of the U.N. Intergovernmental Agencies to give graphic pictures of these worldwide efforts." Now, if that doesn't suggest a really comprehensive program of brainwashing, I don't know what does. Emphasizing the U.N. over our own nation, and suggesting that it is only "people" rather than a fully organized international pseudo-governmental organization with world conquest as its goal.

This program continues through the intermediate grades: "Use audio-visual aids, filmstrips, etc. Name a student to lead class discussion on the subject being viewed. Student's participation is very important." "Art class assignment to draw posters on specific U.N. themes. The school newspaper should call attention to the project." Assign students during the year to keep a U.N. bulletin board. Set up a U.N. bookshelf in the school library." If you are now getting a feeling that there is some contradiction between what UNESCO says it doesn't do, and the suggestions I have just quoted, it just shows that you've been paying attention. And don't think that the high school grades get away without attention.

"Present a model U.N. Assembly session with students acting as delegates" (that's a good idea, providing they can find a school with enough students to portray all the Communist roles.) "Establish U.N. clubs in your high school." "Arrange for the school dramatic society to present a play with a U.N. theme—show a U.N. film after the play." And, here's another goodie—"Schedule a class debate on important issues such as the U.N. decade of development, international police force, disarmament, etc." How does that affect your digestive processes?

And, what resources and materials do the teachers use—since the UNESCO doesn't provide them? The U.N. offers a list of recommended materials which ought to make the hair stand up on your head—no offense to any baldies present. "People and Places," by Margaret Mead—who, strangely enough, is cited for Communist front activities in index 9. "The United Nations in a Developing World," by Vera Micheles Dean—cited in

index 9. U.N.: "The First 16 Years" by Clark M. Eichelberger—one of the founders of the U.N., and cited in index 9. Seven citations, in case you were wondering. "First Book of the U.N.," by Edna Epstein—cited in index 9. "Radio Plays for Young People To Act," by Rose Schneiderman—a real, true-blue American—with only 21 citations in index 9. This is a good one, because in plays, the kids have to memorize the commie propaganda.

Is it any wonder that, after 20 years of this, we are today faced by the W.E.B. Du Bois Clubs, Mario Savio's free and filthy speech movement, the May 2d movement, the progressive labor movement, students for a democratic society, the Young Communist Party, and the rest of the growing list of Communist youth organizations?

Now, I've been hitting my subject hot and heavy, and just touching on the high points of the glorious history of our U.N. I've avoided getting tangled up in the U.N. role in Katanga, where they deliberately raped and pillaged an orderly, Christian, anti-communistic country and turned it over to a chaotic, cannibalistic, communistic, anti-christ dominated Congo. I haven't mentioned how the U.N. deliberately allowed the Russians to send in tankloads of Mongols to massacre the Hungarian Freedom Fighters, and then blocked a motion to officially condemn the action. I have tried to limit my comments to the U.N. threat to America which we support through treaty status—remember?

Now, some of you might ask what difference Communists make in the U.N. Let me site the answer of Mr. Jay Sourwine, a veteran of 15 years in the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, graduate of National University Law School, and legal counsel to the Senate Judiciary Committee. Mr. Sourwine explains that, "every member of the Communist Party has been indoctrinated. Each member has been put under discipline, has been accepted by the party as loyal and reliable, and has accepted as one of his personal obligations to the party the responsibility of using any position he gets for the furtherance of the party's purposes and objectives. This he does on his own initiative where he is not given instructions, and does in strict accordance with party instructions when instructed. The whole job of the Communist is to do those things which will help the party obtain its objective, advancing its propaganda, and making new recruits for the party."

To paraphrase, you can trust a Communist to be and act a Communist, no matter what the situation, and no matter what he says to the contrary—and the U.N. is full of Communists.

Please believe me when I say that lack of military strength is the only reason this conglomeration of Communists and cannibals hasn't yet tried us, and this is rapidly being changed. I wonder, and I would like to have a show of hands if possible, how many of you are familiar with State Department document 7277? How about Public Law 87-297, Public Law 89-27, and Senate Concurrent Resolution 32?

Well, since your business, your freedom, and your very life may literally depend on the effect of these documents, you might be interested in learning more of them: 7277, 87-297, 89-27, and Senate Concurrent Resolution 32 are the combined laws, pending laws, and official proposals which are intended to strip us of our arms, and to turn our military forces over to the United Nations.

Coincidentally, such a move would put our Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard under the direct authority and control of Evgeny Suslov, the Russian Communist who is the Assistant Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs.

Don't look so startled. Under the terms of a verbal agreement between Americans Alger

September 14, 1965

22828

Hiss and Secretary of State Stettinius, and Russians Molotov and Vishinsky, and described in detail by Trygve Lie, the men who have controlled the U.N. military activities (including the Korean conflict) since the formation of the U.N. have been:

Arkady Sobolev, 1946 through 1949, from Russia.

Konstantine Zinchenko, 1949 through 1953, from Russia.

Ilya Tchernyshev, 1953 through 1955, from Russia.

Dragoslav Protitch, 1955 through 1957, a Yugoslavian commie for a change.

Anatoly Dobrynin, 1959 through 1960, from Russia again.

Georgy Arkadev, 1960 through 1962, from Russia.

Evgeny Kiselev, 1962 through 1963, from Russia.

Vladimir Suslov, from 1963 through the present day, from Russia.

Don't you just know that, with our Armed Forces under such leadership, we wouldn't have a single thing to fear from the United Nations? Since we are confronted by Soviet domination of U.N. military affairs, it would pay us to take a closer look at the documents I have mentioned. First, State Department Document 7277, entitled "Freedom From War—The United States Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World." This proposal duplicated, almost point for point, a similar Russian disarmament proposal. Proposing accomplishment in three stages, the document suggests that all nations participate, but also suggests that it would not be impractical for the United States to "set the pace" for other nations by initiating unilateral disarmament.

Now 7277 makes the initial proposal, and Congress passed Public Law 87-297 to implement these proposals. It was Public Law 87-297 that created the infamous U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and it was Public Law 89-297 which extended the power of that Agency for another 3 years, and which gave them another \$33 million to spend while rendering us defenseless; 7277 states, and let me go back to quoting directly: "In order to make possible the achievement of 'complete disarmament,' the program sets forth the following specific objectives toward which nations should direct their efforts. The disbanding of all national armed forces and the prohibition of their reestablishment in any form whatsoever other than those required to preserve internal peace and for contributions to a United Nations peace force."

The elimination from national arsenals of all armaments including all weapons of mass destruction and the means for their delivery, other than those required for a United Nations peace force and for maintaining internal order. The establishment and effective operation of an International Disarmament Organization within the framework of the United Nations to insure compliance at all times with all disarmament obligations: "The negotiating states are called upon to develop the program into a detailed plan for general and complete disarmament and to continue their efforts without interruption until the whole program has been achieved. To this end, they are to seek the widest possible area of agreement at the earliest possible date. At the same time, and without prejudice to progress on the disarmament program, they are to seek agreement on those immediate measures which would contribute to the common security of nations and that could facilitate and form part of the total program."

Of the three stages, the first stage is described as follows: "All states would have adhered to a treaty effectively prohibiting the testing of nuclear weapons." Gentlemen, we have actually done so, but the Russians haven't.

"The production of fissionable materials for use in weapons would be stopped and

quantities of such materials from past production would be converted to nonweapons uses." You should have seen this for yourselves in the newspapers. The Department of Defense stated that America has ceased to produce additional nuclear weapons materials because our present stockpiles were adequate.

It further stated that the larger warheads presently in our inventory were, under current strategy, "obsolete," and were being converted for use in peaceful applications. Russia, on the other hand, is doing just the opposite—constructing ever larger warheads, and increasing their production to the limit of their capability. "States owning nuclear weapons would not relinquish control of such weapons to any nations not owning them, and would not transmit to any such nation information or material necessary for their manufacture." Gentlemen, could it not be the reason why we haven't armed our NATO allies? "Strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles of specified categories and weapons designed to counter such vehicles would be reduced to agreed levels by equitable and balanced steps; their production would be discontinued or limited; their testing would be limited or halted." We've done this too, but Russia hasn't.

We have been led down the garden path by fuzzy headed legislators who believe that man is intellectually and spiritually mature enough to capitalize on the United Nations; who believe that Communists are human enough, and trustworthy enough. (In a Western concept) to do unto us as we are doing unto them. One of the local papers carried an item on July 18, stating that both Secretary of Defense McNamara, and Secretary of State Rusk had admitted to practicing unilateral disarmament in the hope (and I quote) "that other nations would follow suit." And, if you still don't believe that we have been disarming, in every sense of the word, just ask yourself what happened to:

The Thor missile, the Redstone missile, the Jupiter missile, the Atlas missile, the Skybolt missile, the Mobile Minuteman missile program, the Nike-Zeus antimissile missile, the Davy Crockett missile, the Pentomic Army plan, the fleet of nuclear aircraft carriers, the fleet of nuclear missile frigates, the B-47 program, the B-52 program, the B-58 program, the B-70 program, our overseas bases and men, our domestic bases and men, including Stead Air Force Base, right here in Nevada. It has been claimed on the floor of Congress that we are fighting the Vietnam war off the shelf. What happens when our shelf stocks of weapons are used up?

I say that everytime we close a base and Russia opens one.

I say that every time we scrap a plane and Russia builds one.

I say that every time we dismantle a missile and Russia assembles one.

I say that every time we discharge a soldier and Russia drafts one.

I say each of these—no matter how "economical" our Government tells us it might be—each step puts us one step closer to surrender to a Communist dominated United Nations.

Now, I've already spoken longer than I should, and I've barely skimmed the surface of a conspiracy so massive that the mind boggles at its magnitude. Each of the charges I have made, each of the conclusions I have drawn, and each of the quotes I have cited can be borne out by public documents. If there are any of you who would like to ask some questions on this subject, I will be glad to stay around for a short while after the meeting. If you would like to do your own research, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee will be happy to provide you with all the free literature and re-

ports you want. In summation, let me say this: if you love America just half as much as I do, you will make it a point to become familiar with the truth for a change. The time is long overdue to get the United States out of the United Nations, and the United Nations out of the United States. Benjamin Franklin once said that, "I believe in Faith, but it is Doubt which provides education." Seek out the truth, base your opinions on the truth, and then express your opinions to your elected Representatives in Washington. It's up to you. Thank you very much.

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

(Mr. CUNNINGHAM (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to express my support for H.R. 2580, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, which recently passed the House of Representatives.

I believe that legislation of this nature is long overdue and that its eventual enactment has been a foregone conclusion for some time. I should like to congratulate and express my appreciation to the members of the Immigration Subcommittee for the constructive work they have done in formulating this bill. It is the product of many months of hard work on their part.

I have supported this bill because I feel that it will place our immigration selection system upon a more rational basis and one which will better serve the needs of this country. The existing national origins quota system has resulted in an unfair distribution of immigrant visas that has been some countries allotted many more than their needs require while other countries have built up huge waiting lists. The normal forces of supply and demand cannot function under such a system.

The basic inequities in the existing quota system have impelled Congress to enact numerous laws during the past dozen years to meet emergency conditions. These have included laws for the relief of refugees and the victims of natural disasters and to assist in the reunification of families with some of their members barred from entrance by over-subscribed quotas.

The bill that passed the House is designed to take care of problems like these as well as to incorporate other improvements in the law. This legislation emphasizes the importance of reuniting families and at the same time, includes safeguards to protect the American working people from unfair competition and the lowering of wages.

While I supported the bill, I felt that it could have been improved by the adoption of the so-called McGregor amendment limiting the volume of immigration from the Western Hemisphere. Since one of the purposes of the legislation is to eliminate discrimination based on place of birth, I think that we should complete the job by eliminating preference based upon the hemisphere in

September 14, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

which a prospective immigrant happened to be born.

The dire predictions that have been made claiming that this legislation will swamp the country with a new wave of immigration are completely without foundation. The bill would make a moderate increase in the total number of immigrants admissible. At the same time the qualitative controls, excluding certain types of immigrants such as subversives and those likely to become public charges, are retained and even strengthened by the bill.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I supported this legislation.

CLEVELAND SAYS "WELCOME ABOARD" TO DEMOCRATS URGING PAUSE IN HEADLONG LEGISLATIVE PACE

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, as one of the growing number of Members of Congress who, along with many news commentators and private citizens, is deeply concerned by the effects of the headlong pace of this Congress, I welcome similar expressions of concern from the Democratic side. It was with particular gratification that I read of the letter sent today to the President by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] calling for a pause in the pace of legislation in order to give the country time to digest the massive new programs enacted and, indeed, to find the means of paying for them during a period when we shall have to meet increasingly heavy military obligations.

When we Republicans raise these points, the tendency is to dismiss our commentary as partisan carping, in spite of the gravity of the issue to the Nation. So, it is very good to see that similar concerns are being voiced by Members of the majority. Perhaps the views of the gentleman from Indiana, who is president of the organization of first-term Democrats, will receive a more sympathetic hearing. I say to the gentleman, "Welcome aboard." While I hope that my endorsement of his position does not weaken his case with the powers that be, I must say that I think he was absolutely right when he wrote the President that:

It is time to pause. We must take time to work out the most efficient administration (of these programs). Budgetary limitations must be kept in mind, especially with the uncertain costs of continuing our effort in Vietnam.

FEDERAL SALARY ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1965

(Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on September 13 I sent a letter notifying all Members that I proposed

to offer an amendment to the Federal Salary Adjustment Act of 1965 eliminating the 11-step pay structure for employees of Members of the House of Representatives. I now have the amendment prepared, and, in order that every Member may have the opportunity to read it before it is offered, I have asked that it be printed in full here along with the text of my September 13 letter, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 13, 1965.

DEAR COLLEAGUES: Simplification of Members' staff salary allowance will be the subject of an amendment I will submit on the floor when H.R. 10281, the Federal Salary Adjustment Act of 1965, is considered during the week of September 13.

The ridiculously complicated and confusing salary system should be repealed. Many Members in voicing criticism have expressed the opinion that the purpose of the present system was to make our staff salaries appear smaller. Aside from this being a reflection on the Congress, no one is fooled by it. The press has repeatedly attacked it as deceptive and has reported the gross allowance used by each office as well as the gross pay received by individual employees.

Eleven steps of computation are now needed to convert basic pay into gross pay. The increase for congressional employees in section 114 of H.R. 10281 would install a 12th step.

My amendment will provide that a gross staff salary amount be established. The allowance under my amendment will be equal to the maximum now attained by any combination of basics plus the 4.5-percent pay raise in H.R. 10281. Each Member may then adjust the gross salaries in his office at his discretion. It will set a precedent for future raises to increase the total allowance rather than individual salaries.

The amendment will set the maximum payable to any one person at the present gross limit plus 4.5 percent. It will not change the limits on total number of employees allowed. It applies solely to those employed on the office staff of individual Members. However, it is obvious that your support of this amendment would encourage the Committee on House Administration to take similar action in behalf of other employees of the House of Representatives.

I hope you will join with me in eliminating an archaic, cumbersome feature in our disbursing methods and gain greater flexibility and simplicity in the operation of our individual offices.

Sincerely,

JOEL T. BROYHILL.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROYHILL OF VIRGINIA TO H.R. 10281

(Amendment fixing on an aggregate (gross) rate basis the clerk hire allowance of House Members and the compensation rates of employees in House Members' offices; and providing that salaries of employees of House Members be fixed in all cases by action of the individual Member rather than by law and paid from clerk hire)

Page 29, immediately following line 4, insert: "This subsection shall not apply to any employee paid from the clerk hire of a Member or Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives."

On page 29, immediately following the period at the end of line 14, insert: "This subsection shall not apply to the compensation of any employee paid from the clerk hire of a Member or Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives."

On page 30, immediately following line 14, insert the following:

"(f) Beginning with the effective date of this section—

"(1) the annual rate of compensation of each employee paid on such effective date from the clerk hire of a Member or Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives shall be a single per annum rate in an amount which is equal to the sum of the annual basic compensation of such employee in effect immediately prior to such effective date and the rate of his additional compensation in effect immediately prior to such effective date; and

"(2) the annual rate of compensation of any employee paid from the clerk hire of a Member or Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives whose compensation is fixed or adjusted on or after such effective date shall be a single per annum rate constituting his total rate of compensation.

"(g) Section 11(a) of the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended (2 U.S.C. 60g-1), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the clerk hire of each Member and Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives shall be at a single per annum (gross) rate, as follows:

"(1) in the case of each Member and Resident Commissioner the population of whose constituency is less than five hundred thousand (as currently estimated by the Bureau of the Census), such single per annum (gross) rate shall be \$69,130.69; and

"(2) in the case of each Member and Resident Commissioner the population of whose constituency is five hundred thousand or more (as currently estimated by the Bureau of the Census), such single per annum (gross) rate shall be \$75,827.74.

No person shall be paid from such clerk hire at a single per annum (gross) rate in excess of \$19,303.51. Not more than one person shall be paid at a single per annum (gross) rate of \$19,303.51 from such clerk hire at any one time.

"(h) The amounts specified in section 11(a) of the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended by subsection (g) of this section, shall each be increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase provided by subsection (a) of this section.

"(i) The amendment made by subsection (g) of this section shall not be construed to—

"(1) reduce the amount of clerk hire which any Member or Resident Commissioner is receiving immediately prior to the effective date of such amendment;

"(2) limit or otherwise affect any authority for the making of any appointment to, or for fixing or adjusting the compensation for, any position for which the compensation is paid from the clerk hire of a Member or Resident Commissioner;

"(3) affect the continuity of employment of, or reduce the compensation of, any employee paid from such clerk hire; or

"(4) affect the authority provided by H. Res. 294, Eighty-eighth Congress, as continued by H. Res. 7, Eighty-ninth Congress, for the employment of an additional clerk by any Member or Resident Commissioner."

HOME RULE LEGISLATION FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, as the result of a petition discharging the Committee

on the District of Columbia from further consideration of home rule legislation, the Committee on the District of Columbia had to bring the hearings to an abrupt close.

There were many, many witnesses awaiting the opportunity to testify on this important subject who were unable to have the benefit of oral testimony and cross examination.

Some of these individuals and organizations did submit their statements for the record which I hope the Members will take the time to read. However, there is one particular statement, submitted by John M. Kyle II, executive vice president of the Kalorama Citizens Association of the District of Columbia, which I would like to read here and urge that all who read this RECORD note carefully.

Colonel Kyle's statement reads as follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN M. KYLE II, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, THE KALORAMA CITIZENS ASSOCIATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. Chairman, I am John M. Kyle II, executive vice president of the Kalorama Citizens Association. The association was organized in 1919 and there are about 25,000 people in the area served by the organization. By profession I am a legislative research consultant. I have been a citizen of this area for more than 39 years. From 1919 to date our association has supported the present form of District of Columbia government.

I have been a student of retrocession all during my residence here. I supported the Kyle retrocession bill in the 88th Congress and I now support the Broyhill bill, H.R. 10264. I may also say that for the past several years I have been preparing a source book of District of Columbia history.

Mr. Chairman, I support retrocession of the District to Maryland because it is the only lawful way under the Constitution to provide self-government for the people of the District of Columbia. Any other means would require a constitutional amendment. Once fully informed, however, I seriously doubt if the people of this country, or the several States, would ever consent to placing the vast complex of the National Capital under a local government, regardless of form, to rule over it.

There can be no question, however, about the legality of Mr. Broyhill's plan. We have the unshakable precedent of 1846 when the Virginia portion of the original District was retroceded to Virginia. That was 120 years ago. In the 88th Congress there was considerable support for the Kyle bill in this committee, and even the present president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia placed the entire Commission on record as having a favorable attitude toward the bill.

As was to be expected, however, the Commissioner's favorable remarks touched off violent newspaper opposition, and one paper editorialized that every public official in Maryland was against the bill. But when the editor was asked to furnish the names of such officials the request was not granted. The facts are that the people of Maryland nor the general assembly thereof have never had an opportunity to pass upon the question and the recent curbstone remarks of the Governor of that State, while a bit witty, have no meaning.

Then the Attorney General of the United States stepped in and furnished the committee a voluminous adverse report on the Kyle bill and upon which the opponents of the Broyhill bill now rely. That biased and colored report filled throughout with trivia

and nonsequiturs is a scare document and it is little more than picaresque argument.

He cites numerous instances, in disregard of the 1846 precedent, where retrocession might be illegal or unconstitutional once it is placed before the courts, but in another place, and apparently to save face, he tells the Committee that the Department of Justice is not passing on the constitutionality of the bill since such must be left to the courts.

One argument against the Kyle bill was that retrocession would make Silver Spring a larger city than Baltimore. This was thrown in, no doubt, for Baltimore's consumption; but how does the Attorney General know that Maryland would not fragment the ceded territory by constituting one or more new counties and by chartering new cities and towns in the ceded territory? Certainly Georgetown would ask for the restoration of its 1764 charter. The report is as silent as death on the fact that retrocession would give Maryland two or possibly three additional seats in the House of Representatives and many more seats in the Maryland General Assembly not to mention that the tax revenues paid by an additional half million people.

In the report the Attorney General attempts to throw out another scare by pretending that the status of wills and title deeds would be legally affected. But he doesn't say how? Does he not know that these have never presented any trouble with the transference of other jurisdictions during our long history?

As another scare he pretends that the transference of public utilities corporations might bring on fatal consequences.

Although Mr. Broyhill's bill would make that question moot the Attorney General points out that it would be necessary for the District to obtain a permit from Maryland to put on an inaugural parade—as if such parades hold status in law. The indication is, I suppose, that Maryland might not issue the permit so that we couldn't inaugurate a President.

In justification of the report the Attorney General claims that with its three electoral votes the District of Columbia holds a life or death stranglehold over the election of a President. He cites the three instances of presidential elections being thrown into the House of Representatives. How stupid does he believe you gentlemen to be? Since when has the most arduous partisan ever claimed that the District has a tie-breaking status? And if the same three electoral votes should be transferred to Maryland would the result not be the same in any close election? How can any Attorney General foresee the result of any election when the most noted pollsters have often been wrong? Perhaps the Attorney General has been reading some old prelection copies of the Literary Digest.

Actually the most energetic opponents of retrocession have not scored a single point against Mr. Broyhill's bill, for the simple fact that law, precedent, and history are against them. Do the opponents really want complete self-government plus real voting representation in the Senate and the House of Representatives or do they rather not seek to set up an illegal single party government in the District of Columbia with an unconstitutional method of financing it as contemplated by the Senate-passed bill, S. 1118? Do they not intend to establish a political machine with all the evils of a spoils system?

If the Senate-passed bill should become law what may we expect?

The bill does not provide employment security for the thousands of present District employees. It authorizes the new government to institute its own merit system. It is generally known that those who would control the new government are bitter enemies of our police department and this

means the ultimate destruction of that force and its replacement with loyal machine but inexperienced personnel and civilian review boards such as are advocated by race agitators, bleeding hearts, and do-gooders about the country.

If the crime situation is bad now, what are we to expect under the new government?

Although proponents of the Senate bill claim that employees of the new government will be protected by the Hatch Act, such simply isn't the case. These employees will, to all intents and purposes, become cogs in the political machine—if they are to survive. As the bill is drawn this is inescapable.

The city government payrolls will be doubled in less than 2 years. There is no limitation so that the city council can create as many new positions as it sees fit.

There can be no question about it, the new government will institute and enlarge welfare and poverty programs that will practically make every District resident eligible for some form of relief or handout. The man in the house will be here to stay. Prostitutes, homosexuals, and dope pushers could ride the relief roles without detection. There will be no sincere effort to promote training programs looking to the rehabilitation of the unskilled and placing them in self-respecting and gainful employment. The outright dole will be the order of the day.

The National Capital Planning Commission will not have veto power over the new zoning commission; the Federal Government which owns one-half of the District land area will have no representation on the city council nor the zoning commission. This is absolutely preposterous. To protect the Federal interest it will be vitally necessary for the Congress to intervene from time to time. Not only should at least two members of the city council be representatives of the Federal Government, at least two members of the zoning commission should also be Federal officials. Under this impossible situation but little imagination is required to envision the numerous conflicts that are certain to arise.

Spokesmen for the Senate bill have indicated that the new government will emerge on a public housing program that staggers the imagination. Apparently such housing and rent subsidies are to be provided for all applicants regardless of means. The "impoverished" have been led to expect this utopia and thus we are to have a welfare city on a scale beyond the wildest dreams of the most dedicated Socialist.

What about the elected school board provided for by the Senate bill? What have the potential leaders in the new government led us to expect?

This board will scrap the present progressive building program and will launch its own program that would break the treasury of a Croesus or of any ancient Persian prince.

The people who would make up this new board are pledged to abolish the track system so that gifted pupils will be compelled to waste their time and talents while grouped with those of less brilliance. There is nothing new or revolutionary about this system. It just makes for commonsense.

Those who will control the new board would eliminate discipline in the schools by pulverizing corporal punishment for which there is no known substitute.

They will immediately gerrymander the school districts and start bussing schoolchildren from one side of the city to the other to promote school integration which no law or court decision now requires.

The Superintendent of Schools will no doubt be required to put on a chef's apron and operate a chain of restaurants to feed every "hungry" pupil in the city, including breakfast as it is to be presumed that there is no food for them in their homes. More than that, the city welfare program is cer-

tion reverses decisions and procedures of long-standing made by the Commission in authorizing particular refuges, and in providing for disposal of refuges purchased with duck stamp moneys in accordance with Commission actions of the past.

It should be remembered that there are many refuges and lands within refuges that were brought into the national wildlife refuge system by means other than specific action on the part of the Migratory Bird Commission. Many wildlife refuge areas—game and wildlife ranges, for example—were created by Executive order or by transfer of lands from other Government agencies and many of these areas have broader national wildlife conservation purposes than that of facilitating the conservation of migratory birds.

It may well be that there are units in our wildlife refuge system which, having outlived their usefulness as wildlife and waterfowl habitats, should be eliminated or reduced—despite the fact that the basic statute, the Migratory Bird Commission Act provides in its title for the acquisition of these areas of land and water "in perpetuity." Nevertheless, the Secretary's action or determination as the case may be raises questions of public policy.

I think it should be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that this is a program set up by the Congress and administered by a Commission created by the Congress, as trustees for the funds of American duck hunters and other contributing conservationists who came to us and asked that we provide a duck stamp and use the proceeds to acquire necessary land for migratory bird refuges.

In addition, we are trustees of the funds of organizations and private individuals, who have contributed millions of dollars for acquisition, and in some cases development, of these refuges.

As trustees of the funds of duck hunters, private individuals, and conservation groups, it follows that there is a very definite congressional responsibility when it comes to removing these lands from our national wildlife refuge system.

For this reason the proposed authority of the Commission to oversee the disposal of refuge land has been broadened, in my bill, to include all lands in the refuge system, rather than merely those lands which were brought in through specific Commission action.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that introduction of this legislation will serve to check this move to eliminate needed existing refuges, and will lead to a better and a more systematic method of overseeing the operation of all refuges. It is time that the proper role of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission be fully recognized.

THE GUILTY IN CALIFORNIA

(Mr. WAGGONNER (at the request of Mr. ROOSEVELT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker,

there are times when an item appears in print that so perfectly reflects your own views that you can only say, "I wish I had said that." Such an article was James J. Kilpatrick's column in the Evening Star of August 20.

I would like to make it a part of the Record against the day when the flood of crocodile tears has ebbed and the true culprits are searched for. The answer is right here for any who seek it:

All week long, the leading bleeding hearts of the Great Society have been wetting down the ashes of Los Angeles with tears for the poor oppressed. We have been fairly awash in tales of Watts, the palm-lined ghetto, with its unemployment, its crime, its incomes below \$4,000.

"The guilt lies on us all," said one lugubrious professor, gazing sadly into the camera. And he began to talk of frustrations that just had to find catharsis.

Twaddle. The guilt for this criminal anarchy in Los Angeles is direct, immediate, and personal, as guilt must always be if the first essentials of our law still count for anything. And if guilt is to be extended in some sort of metaphysical conjecture, then let the guilt lie squarely upon such philosophers as the Reverend Martin Luther King and President Johnson.

What did the Negro apologists of our time expect? How could they have been surprised by these events? Have they never heard of the harvest that is reaped by men who sow the wind?

For the last 5 years or more, Dr. King has been going up and down the country, preaching his own brand of ever-loving anarchy. His is the gospel that tells his simple-minded people to violate the laws they feel in their hearts to be wrong. What is the guilt that lies today on Dr. King?

Dr. King is not alone. Over this same period, we have seen the White House itself and our Central Government as a whole contribute to a cynical disrespect for old institutions. The Constitution, once regarded as the supreme law of the land, has been progressively reduced to the merest scrap of paper. This Republic was founded in part, at least, upon respect for the ancient rights of private property; this was the oldest human right of them all, but Congress and the courts have let it erode away. Is it any wonder that the Los Angeles insurrectionists put private property to the torch?

Over the last 10 years, the American Negro has been singled out for a fulsome solicitude that has done him a terrible disservice. Through every conceivable device of law and politics, the Negro has been artificially puffed up, protected, pampered, wrapped in swaddling clothes, and excessively admired. He has been the particular object of public housing, poverty programs, job preferment, and aid for his illegitimate offspring. In the sanctified name of "civil rights," he has been excused for criminal conduct that in any other set of facts would have drawn 30 days on the roads. The Supreme Court of the United States, casting precedent to the winds, pardons hundreds of trespassers, disturbers of the peace, and violators of the rights of other men—pardons them with a wave of judicial wands. What guilt lies on the Supreme Court of the United States?

It is high time in this country to cut through the fatty sentimentality, the phony guilt, the couch-ridden recriminations. If rhetorical questions are to be asked, should we not inquire if the status of the Negro, a century after emancipation, is entirely the fault of white society? Entirely? Or is a large part of this squarely the fault of the Negro people themselves?

It is said that the Negro has been kept down by the devices of segregation, and

doubtless there is truth in this. But the whole of the proposition never is examined. Were all Negroes kept down? Or were many Negroes too lazy to get up? Say what you will about the South (it is not the South where whole cities go up in the flames of insurrection), the American Negro has had two generations of reasonable opportunity in the unsegregated North and West. How has he developed the opportunities put before him? In squalor, in apathy, in crime, in cadging off the welfare, in dropping out of integrated schools, in breeding swarms of children out of wedlock. This is the sorry record. And now, in Los Angeles, we witness barbarian hordes.

What is the remedy? It is to treat the Negro like a white man. God knows his race has done little enough to deserve a fate so difficult and demanding. This is to expect of the Negro, first of all, work; and then self-restraint; obedience to law; respect for authority; creative imagination, right conduct. It is to expect of him some capacity for leadership; some positive contribution to the communities he lives in, some sense of common decency in the maintenance of neighborhoods. This is the white man's world—a world that earns its way, accepts responsibilities, knows failure, knows success, and does not search for somewhere else to lay a personal blame.

Plenty of Negroes have shown they understand these elementary obligations. Especially in the South, a Negro middle class is rising, buying property, entering public life, setting a fine example of civic responsibility. Elsewhere in the country, examples multiply of individual excellence. If only the dogooders will stop expecting too much of the Negro too soon. If only they will learn that pampering and special privilege and legislative crutches cannot do the job. If only they will understand that the character of a backward people cannot be tempered in Molotov cocktails.

Respect for law, respect for property, respect for the rights of others—these have to come first. And these must be enforced by the courts and by the suddenly stiffened demands of a fed-up society. The guilt for these outrages lies upon individual arsonists, hoodlums, vandals, thieves. Try them. And then turn to the political and intellectual leaders who need forgiveness more: they know not what they do.

SOUTH BEND, IND., PROJECT HEAD START

(Mr. BRADEMUS (at the request of Mr. ROOSEVELT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMUS. Mr. Speaker, a successful Project Head Start program conducted this summer in South Bend, Ind., is graphically described in the following account that appeared in the South Bend, Ind., Tribune on August 15, 1965.

Mr. Birdsell, author of the article, makes two telling points that I draw to the attention of my colleagues. First, he says:

There was agreement that the Head Start graduates have a better chance for success in kindergarten and subsequent progress.

Second, he writes:

However, staff members did agree they were given rather complete freedom by Federal officials. There was no interference in the classroom as such or in many other program aspects.

The article follows:

SOUTH BEND EDUCATORS GIVE 90 UNDERPRIVILEGED CHILDREN A GENUINE HEAD START (By Roger Eldsall)

Bringing order out of chaos has been a unique privilege for a small band of South Bend educators and their assistants this summer.

In 8 weeks, they have given 90 underprivileged children a genuine head start when they enter kindergarten this fall.

"Now, they can follow directions. They can listen. What more could you want?" Mrs. Lucia Howe asked.

Mrs. Howe speaks from experience. She is a veteran kindergarten teacher at Navarre School.

Eighty weeks ago in a Harrison School classroom, she met 15 youngsters, whom many would have dismissed as impossible to educate.

Starting literally from scratch, she and her colleagues are convinced time, patience, and money wisely expended can reclaim children almost automatically rejected by American education practices of the past.

The money in this case, \$13,275, came from the Federal Government under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The time and patience came from the entire local project staff, headed by Mrs. Sylvia Whitmer, and, rather unexpectedly, the parents of the children themselves.

In an informal discussion last week, the final one of the program, several of the professional staff members agreed the successful involvement of parents was their key to success.

PARENTS COOPERATE

Parental cooperation could and did reduce itself to the stark necessity of getting the child out of bed and to the bus which carried him to the school. (Three classes each at Harrison and Studebaker School.)

It could and did expand to introduction of the whole idea of education as a good thing to families with a whole inheritance of economic cultural and emotional deprivation.

"There is a fear in simply going to school, of meeting the teacher and the whole process of education," Mrs. Carol Davis, who handled one of the Studebaker classes, remarked.

Staff members said the importance of getting the parents concerned, interested and active in the child's education cannot be overstated.

"With possibly one exception, we found that when the parents were interested the child was more successful in the program," Richard Matthews, staff psychologist, reported.

Mrs. Whitmer said persistent but highly informal contacts with the home were very successful and became standard practice almost from the start.

Teachers and other staff members would visit individual homes during the afternoons and evenings. During the mornings, when classes were in session, parents were invited in for extended visits, one or two at a time, not in large groups.

Parents on these visits were encouraged to assist in classroom activities, to stay for the lunch which was part of the program and to go on "field trips" outside the classroom.

Staff members found the developing interaction between the child, the school and the home where parents became concerned one of the most fruitful consequences of the program.

Richard Brocker, a case worker for the St. Joseph County Department of Public Welfare who worked closely with the program, said there were instances of "youngsters almost attacking their parents" to become interested.

Staff members agreed that economically depressed, undereducated parents whose

energies are concentrated on barely making a living can be motivated not only to toleration but assisting in the education of their children.

PREKINDERGARTEN TRAINING

They agreed that the sense of self-discipline, the increased "attention span," so vital to the more formal education of later years can be developed in a prekindergarten age group of reasonable native intelligence whatever the social background.

Mrs. Whitmer spoke of an approach deliberately "unstructured to work toward the structured program" which the child will enter in the kindergarten.

Staff members agreed that the first 2 weeks were quite chaotic in the classroom, but gradually a sense of order developed. A visitor to several rooms in the final week found an atmosphere of order, purpose and activity typical of the normal kindergarten.

Frankly, as Matthews said, the program attempted to "send these children into kindergarten with the middle-class background they do not receive in their homes."

Staff observations and formal testing results "show a definite move towards a middle-class norm in these students," Matthews reported.

A NATIONAL EFFORT

Head Start here was part of a national effort this summer and was one aspect of President Johnson's war on poverty under the Economic Opportunity Act.

Nationally, there has been criticism of the crash aspects of the program. Critics say it attempted to take in too many youngsters, about 550,000; ran too short a time, and was not thought out sufficiently.

These pitfalls appear to have been avoided locally to a certain extent by deliberate restriction of the initial enrollment to 90 students and in selection of staff.

Mrs. Whitmer operates her own private nursery school during the regular school term. The six classroom teachers were drawn from the experienced kindergarten and primary faculty of the public schools.

Nevertheless, and despite the considerable successes, staff members said there is definite room for improvement in the future on the basis of the experience of the last 8 weeks.

MORE TIME NEEDED

More time is the basic need from the staff viewpoint. Staff members felt keenly the termination of the program just at the point when, they felt, the children were ready for even greater strides.

The children will be entering kindergarten in the fall, but staff members were worried they might be lost and regress in a situation of about 35 students and one teacher.

In staff discussions, the need for starting the program earlier, perhaps running it through the regular school year in whole or in part was urged, though the resulting problems of finance and housing were recognized.

Despite these concerns, there was agreement that the Head Start graduates have a better chance for success in kindergarten and subsequent progress.

"If we have saved only five of these children from educational failure in the future, then we have justified the spending of nearly \$14,000," Matthews declared.

READY TO EXPAND PROJECT

Staff members also felt they were now ready for a program taking in more students than the 90 in the initial project. No one doubted that more than 90 prekindergarten youngsters could qualify.

There was also a feeling that enrollment should be based not just on an economic standard, that educational deprivation can result from other factors. The Federal act restricts enrollment to children from families with an annual income of \$2,000 or less.

If there was initial chaos in the classroom, there was a feeling of rather persistent chaos

in Washington. Materials, particularly standardized tests, sent out from Washington were frequently late.

The staff said the 1-week training session at Purdue University, Lafayette, dictated by Washington, suffered from lack of planning. They felt Head Start succeeded here because of local knowledge and experience rather than as a result of direction from above.

NO FEDERAL INTERFERENCE

However, staff members did agree they were given rather complete freedom by Federal officials. There was no interference in the classroom as such or in many other program aspects.

Mrs. Whitmer said one of the major lessons of the initial program was the importance of an earlier effort to start immunization against communicable disease and health improvement generally.

(On the other hand, Mrs. Whitmer said, left to the parents, immunization would not have started in most cases and the child could not have entered kindergarten this fall as a result. All but six children were started on immunization by last week.)

The real importance of the three assistants assigned to each classroom teacher was rather a revelation to the professional staff. Indeed, they thought even more assistance would be desirable in the future.

"STEP" GIVES HELP

Mrs. Whitmer said one of the pleasantest surprises of the program was the success in the classroom assistant role of several teenagers enrolled in the Step program.

Step gives teenagers who have dropped out of school or are potential dropouts part-time employment, intensive counseling and the chance to resume schooling in some form. It is also supported by the Economic Opportunity Act.

Step enrollees are from low income families like the Head Start youngsters, and Mrs. Whitmer said the older youths appeared to be learning as much from their experience as the youngsters they were helping educate.

Another key to success, Mrs. Whitmer said, was the close cooperation of the two welfare case workers, Broecker and Dean Burket, particularly in contacts with the parents.

Initially, they helped select the students for the program, but then were assigned to follow-up work on a part-time basis. Mrs. Whitmer said the decision to continue their services was one of the most important made locally.

(Mr. BINGHAM (at the request of Mr. ROOSEVELT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. BINGHAM'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

A PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2580, THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT OF 1965

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. ROOSEVELT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, or at the earliest appropriate time, I intend to introduce an amendment to H.R. 2580, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965. My amendment would permit the naturalization as citizens of persons over 50 years of age

August 24, 1965

20831

who have been living in the United States for at least 20 years.

The amendment would relieve the persons affected from certain hardships imposed upon them because of the present wording of section 312(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The language of the amendment is the same as the bill which I first introduced last year and which I have reintroduced this year, H.R. 3932. Last year, the bill won wide support, in fact, bipartisan support. I am hopeful that those who received it well last year will give it the same amount of consideration during the present debate.

Section 312 now provides for a literacy test for all persons wishing to become naturalized as American citizens. Subsection (1) of section 312 contains a proviso excepting any person who on the effective date of the act is over 50 years of age and has been living in the United States for periods totaling 20 years. The crucial words in the proviso are "on the effective date of this act." These words create a closed end classification benefiting only those persons who came to the United States prior to December 24, 1932, that is, 20 years preceding "the effective date of this act." My amendment would simply change the language of 312(1) to read "at the time of his petition for naturalization." The change in language would create an open end classification, allowing persons to fall within the exception when they have lived in the United States for at least 20 years, even though they may have come in after 1932.

BACKGROUND OF SECTION 312(1)

Prior to 1950 the immigration and nationality law did not contain a literacy requirement. There was a requirement under the 1940 act that persons who wished to become naturalized must speak the English language. But there was no requirement that he be able to read and write in English. Section 304 of the 1940 act contained the following language:

Sec. 304. No person except as otherwise provided in this act shall hereafter be naturalized as a citizen of the United States upon his own petition who cannot speak the English language.

But let me emphasize again that this requirement meant only that the person know how to speak English, and not that he read and write in English.

The literacy requirement for naturalization was first introduced in to the law with the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950. Section 30 of the 1950 act contained a proviso stating:

Sec. 30. * * * this requirement shall not apply to * * * any person who, on the date of approval of this amendment, is over 50 years of age and has been legally residing in the United States for 20 years.

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 reenacted this literacy requirement with a similar proviso in section 312. Thus, in effect, in 1952 the exemption was updated by 2 years. Under the 1950 act only persons who came into this country prior to 1930 could benefit from the exemption. Under the 1952 act, as I have pointed out, persons must have

entered the United States prior to 1932 in order to come under the exemption.

EFFECTS OF THE PRESENT LAW

The pertinent portions of the present law follows:

SEC. 312. No person except as otherwise provided in this title shall hereafter be naturalized as a citizen of the United States upon his own petition who cannot demonstrate (1) an understanding of the English language, including an ability to read, write, and speak words in ordinary usage in the English language: *Provided*, That this requirement shall not apply to any person physically unable to comply therewith, if otherwise qualified to be naturalized, or to any person who on the effective date of this Act, is over 50 years of age and has been living in the United States for periods totaling 20 years.

As I have previously indicated the only change in the existing law that my amendment would make would be to take out the phrase "on the effective date of this act" and to substitute the words "at the time of his petition for naturalization." My amendment would not eliminate the literacy requirement. All that it does is to eliminate the arbitrary date of 1932 as the year in which persons must have come into the United States in order to come within the proviso exempting persons over 50 years of age who have been here for at least 20 years.

The effect of the present law is this: if a man emigrated from Mexico to the United States in 1932 and is now over 50 years old, he may be naturalized as a citizen even though he cannot read and write English. This is because he has resided in this country at least 20 years preceding the 1952 act. In fact such a man would have resided in this country for 32 years. But if this same man came into the country from Mexico in 1933, or 1934, or 1940, or any time after 1932, he can never qualify for naturalization if he cannot read and write English. He may live in the United States for 20 years, or 25 years, or 30 years. He may be 50 years old, or 60 years old, or 70 years old. He may have had children born to him in the United States. He may have raised his family and seen his children, who are citizens because they were born here, go off to fight and maybe die for America. He may have grandchildren and even great grandchildren who are citizens of the United States, yet, he will never come within the exemption set out in section 312(1) simply because he entered the United States after 1932.

Of course, this applies to persons who came to the United States from other countries. I have used Mexico as an example because in my hometown of San Antonio and throughout my district, and in south Texas and other places along the Mexican border there are a number of persons who fall into the category I have outlined. There are people in these areas from Mexico who are more than 50 years old and who have lived here for more than 20 years. I received one letter from a man who is 71 years old. He has children who were born in this country and who are therefore citizens. But he himself can

never become a citizen because he came here after 1932 and he cannot read and write English.

Some of these people have lived here 25 and 30 years. They have worked hard most of their adult lives. They have paid taxes to the State and Federal Governments. They have raised children here. Yet these people can never become citizens under the present law. Many of the people affected, by the way, are women who because of the demands of raising families were never able to take advantage of opportunities for learning English, and because of their advanced years have little or no chance of ever becoming proficient in our language.

The 1952 act updated by 2 years the exemption set out in section 312(1). Congress by that action established a precedent of updating this exemption, and the 89th Congress would be perfectly consistent in once again updating it. But in so doing we would be merely postponing for some future Congress the task of correcting the inequity which I believe the present wording of 312(1) creates. For this reason I will offer my amendment tomorrow.

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. ROOSEVELT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE SEEKS TO ASSURE SAFETY OF DRUGS

(Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. ROOSEVELT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the key safeguards of the constitutional democracy we enjoy in the United States is an intricate network of checks and balances, both between and within the various levels of government. The maintenance of a genuine separation and balance of powers between the legislative and executive branches of our National Government is an essential element in this structure.

There is widespread agreement among students of government that there has been in recent years a serious diminution of the position of Congress in relation to the burgeoning bureaucracy of the executive branch. In my opinion, one of the factors most responsible for this imbalance is the increasing involvement of the executive agencies in scientific and technical programs. Neither the Members nor the relatively limited staffs of the Congress, few of whom are scientists, are trained to deal with the technical details of these activities. Nor is this necessary for proper legislative oversight, which, after all, is concerned principally

with matters of policy and administrative performance.

However, there appears to be a great deal of resentment and even resistance on the part of some Government scientists to legislative branch examination of the administration of their programs on the grounds that we are not scientists and, therefore, cannot understand the problems involved. This attitude, unfortunately, often leads to a head-on collision between an executive agency and a congressional committee, and all too often, I am afraid, scientific groups outside of the Government instinctively rally to the support of the executive agency without bothering to examine the merits of the matter.

Perhaps this is a manifestation of the "two cultures," the scientific and the nonscientific, about which the noted British scientist and author C. P. Snow has written at some length. As chairman of the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, which has responsibility for the oversight of several executive agencies engaged in scientific activities, I have witnessed several such happenings.

One notable example was the subcommittee's study several years ago of the management of the health research grant programs of the National Institutes of Health. A recent instance involves the subcommittee's current study of the drug safety activities of the Food and Drug Administration.

Prior to and during several of the subcommittee's hearings on drug safety, the FDA Medical Director took offense at our probing into the manner in which the agency fulfills its responsibilities in this area—an area, I might add, which is vital to the health and very lives of the American people. As a result, he attempted to withhold from the subcommittee information necessary to the successful fulfillment of its responsibilities to the Congress. This information consisted principally of reports received by FDA concerning patients who were adversely affected in the course of using specific drugs. Such reports are of great importance to the FDA in deciding whether to withdraw a harmful drug from the market or otherwise restrict its use. And such reports are also important to a congressional committee when it undertakes to review FDA's use of the available information in reaching regulatory decisions.

I am pleased to say that the medical director failed in this ill-advised attempt to withhold information, just as the FDA itself had failed in 1962 when the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee rejected the agency's legislative proposal to seal off from the Congress certain records which are readily available to the executive and judicial branches of the Government.

Subsequently, the medical director sought to muster support for his actions and objectives among certain scientific groups, some of which are rather closely tied to the regulated industry. I think it is significant, however, that few, if any, of these groups bothered to study the transcripts of the hearings or to otherwise obtain the subcommittee's evidence

and views before expressing themselves. It is also significant that the subcommittee has received a considerable volume of correspondence from physicians and private citizens who read about our hearings in the press and wrote to commend the subcommittee for its diligence in protecting the interests of the medical profession and the consuming public.

I find it disappointing and alarming when groups from the scientific community throw scientific method to the winds by adopting resolutions or expressing opinions concerning governmental matters about which they are not adequately informed. This has been the case in a number of instances where the FDA Medical Director, whose administrative actions have been closely examined by the subcommittee, has met with non-governmental scientists who have then passed resolutions on the basis of his statements. In one such instance, the FDA Medical Director actually called a special meeting of the FDA Medical Advisory Board for the purpose of obtaining support for his actions and his personal views. The Board passed a number of resolutions, including one which reads in part:

We are deeply concerned, therefore, at the recent insistence of a congressional committee that confidential records containing specific names of doctors, patients, and hospitals, be released.

We therefore recommend that steps be taken through appropriate channels so that in the future the confidentiality of these records will be preserved.

I can assure the House, as the FDA well knows, that the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee has never in any way violated or compromised the doctor-patient relationship. Since the FDA is aware that statements and implications of this kind are untrue, I can only conclude that this and similar resolutions are intended to distract scientific and public attention from the facts disclosed by the subcommittee's drug safety investigation.

Even more important, however, is the very serious implication that the Congress is less prudent or trustworthy than the executive branch when dealing with information that merits special care. I am sure that my colleagues resent, as I do, the argument that records in a Government agency's files are released or their confidentiality violated because a congressional committee examines them in the course of carrying out its duties.

The general press and some of the trade press have, in my opinion, provided balanced and objective reporting of the subcommittee's hearings and the subsequent controversy, for which I am appreciative. I was especially pleased to see a very thoughtful article by Miss Elinor Langer in the August 13 issue of *Science*, the distinguished journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, which places this matter in a proper perspective and makes clear that the subcommittee has been operating with reasonableness in seeking to discharge its responsibilities. Miss Langer also offers some interesting observations on the tendency of some ele-

ments within the scientific community to rally automatically to the support of their colleagues in the executive branch whenever the latter comes into conflict with the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly commend the article to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress.

[From *Science* magazine, Aug. 13, 1965]

FDA: SCIENTIFIC, MEDICAL GROUPS SUPPORT AGENCY IN DISPUTE WITH FOUNTAIN OVER ACCESS TO DRUG DATA

(By Elinor Langer)

A congressional investigation of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) that began over a year ago in low-keyed fashion has recently become the focus of an argument over the rightful limits of legislative inquiry into scientific and medical affairs. The argument finds Representative L. H. FOUNTAIN, Democrat, of North Carolina, in a familiar but not altogether comfortable spot—at odds with a substantial portion of the medical and scientific communities.

FOUNTAIN's dispute with the FDA began when the House Government Operations Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, of which he is chairman, moved from the general considerations which had occupied it for nearly a year to concrete studies of FDA's handling of particular drugs. FDA's policy on giving information to Congress has only one formal limit: FDA may not disclose pharmaceutical industry secrets, such as formulas. For the rest, however, the policy is more or less dependent on political winds. When congressional-executive relations are poor (as, for example, when the Eisenhower administration faced a Democratic Congress), the rule book for executive agencies calls for a certain amount of closeness with agency information. When they are good, as they are at the moment, the word goes out that executive agencies are expected to be open and helpful. Few civil servants enjoy having their official actions prominently displayed before the public, and this openness may go against the bureaucratic grain. (A few years ago, for example, the Food and Drug Administration attempted to have the law changed to enable it to cover a wider range of documents with a blanket of confidentiality—and one of the opponents of this move, which was unsuccessful, was L. H. FOUNTAIN, who was beginning to develop an interest in the agency's operations.)

In general, however, agencies have very little choice about supplying information. But in the present case, what seemed to the agency to be "cooperation" seemed to the Fountain committee and staff to be bureaucratic foot dragging or, worse, deliberate obfuscation. Committee investigators did have access to the files they requested, but often the files would have inexplicable gaps, and the investigators had to make five or six trips before they felt their grasp of the situation was adequate. In addition, the staff was troubled by an agency ruling (later relaxed) that required a representative from the Commissioner's office to be present whenever the staff interviewed a lower ranking official of FDA.

At several points in the hearing it was made clear that FOUNTAIN felt cooperation to be more mythical than real. But the simmering antagonisms did not burst open until the agency attempted publicly to discourage FOUNTAIN from obtaining certain documentation he felt he needed. There were two items at issue. One was a tape recording of a meeting of scientific consultants called to advise the agency on a particular group of antihistaminic drugs. The second was a list of names of patients for whom adverse reactions to an antidepressant drug (Par-nate) had recently been reported, together with the name of the reporting physician.

August 24, 1965

Celler	Hollifield	Philbin
Chelf	Horton	Pickle
Clausen,	Hosmer	Pike
Don H.	Howard	Pirnie
Cleveland	Hull	Poage
Clevenger	Hungate	Powell
Cohelan	Huot	Price
Cooley	Ichord	Pucinski
Corman	Irwin	Purcell
Craley	Jacobs	Race
Culver	Jennings	Randall
Cunningham	Joelson	Redlin
Daddario	Johnson, Calif.	Reid, N.Y.
Daniels	Johnson, Okla.	Reuss
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Ala.	Rhodes, Pa.
Dawson	Jones, Mo.	Rivers, Alaska
de la Garza	Karsten	Roberts
Delaney	Karsh	Rodino
Dent	Kastenmeter	Rogers, Colo.
Denton	Kelly	Rogers, Fla.
Diggs	Keogh	Rogers, Tex.
Dingell	King, Calif.	Ronan
Donohue	King, Utah	Roncalio
Dow	Kirwan	Rooney, N.Y.
Downing	Kluczynski	Rooney, Pa.
Dulski	Krebs	Roosevelt
Duncan, Oreg.	Leggett	Rosenthal
Dwyer	Long, Md.	Rostenkowski
Dyal	Love	Roush
Edmondson	McCarthy	Roybal
Edwards, Calif.	McDowell	St Germain
Evans, Colo.	McFall	St. Onge
Everett	McGrath	Scheuer
Evins, Tenn.	McVicker	Schisler
Fallon	Macdonald	Schmidhauser
Farbstein	Machen	Schweiker
Farnsley	Mackay	Secrest
Farnum	Mackie	Senner
Fascell	Madden	Shipley
Feighan	Mahon	Sickles
Fino	Maillard	Sikes
Fisher	Marsh	Slack
Flood	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Iowa
Fogarty	Mathias	Stafford
Foley	Matsunaga	Staggers
Ford	Mathews	Stalbaum
William D.	Meads	Steed
Fraser	Miller	Stephens
Friedel	Mills	Stratton
Fulton, Tenn.	Minish	Stubblefield
Gallagher	Mink	Sullivan
Garmatz	Mize	Sweeney
Gialmo	Moeller	Teague, Tex.
Gibbons	Monagan	Tenzer
Gilbert	Moorhead	Thompson, Tex.
Gilligan	Morgan	Trimble
Gonzalez	Morris	Tunney
Grabowski	Morrison	Tupper
Gray	Morse	Tuten
Green, Pa.	Moss	Udall
Greigg	Multer	Ullman
Griener	Murphy, Ill.	Van Deerlin
Griffin	Murphy, N.Y.	Vanik
Griffiths	Murray	Vigorito
Hagen, Calif.	Natcher	Vivian
Halpern	Nedzi	Walker, N. Mex.
Hamilton	Nix	Watts
Hanley	O'Brien	Weitner
Hansen, Iowa	O'Hara, Ill.	White, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.	O'Hara, Mich.	White, Tex.
Hardy	O'Konski	Whitten
Harris	Olsen, Mont.	Widnall
Harvey, Mich.	Olson, Minn.	Willis
Hathaway	O'Neill, Mass.	Wilson
Hawkins	Ottinger	Charles H.
Hays	Patman	Wolf
Hechler	Patten	Wright
Helstoski	Pepper	Young
Hicks	Perkins	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—32

Andrews,	Dole	Rumsfeld
George W.	Flynt	Ryan
Baring	Green, Oreg.	Sisk
Bolling	Hagan, Ga.	Thomas
Bonner	Hanna	Thompson, N.J.
Burton, Utah	Holland	Todd
Cabell	Kee	Toll
Cahill	Kornegay	Watkins
Clark	Landrum	Yates
Conyers	Lindsay	
Cramer	Resnick	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Rumsfeld.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Dole.
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Lindsay.

Mr. Kee with Mr. George W. Andrews.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Clark.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Ryan.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Todd.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

AA *[Signature]* WMK
AMENDING THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 533 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 533

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed five hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and pending that I now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 533 provides for consideration of H.R. 2580,

a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule with 5 hours of debate, making it in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The purpose of H.R. 2580 is the elimination of the national origins quota system as a basis for selection of immigrants into the United States. This is a substantial change in the present law.

H.R. 2580 establishes a new system of selection for immigrants which is designed to be fair, rational, humane, and in the national interests. Under this system primary preference is based upon the existence of a close family relationship to U.S. citizens or permanent resident aliens, and not on the existing basis of birthplace or ancestry. Preference is also provided for those professional people whose services are urgently needed in the United States. Lesser preference is given to aliens capable of filling labor needs. The annual numerical ceiling for all immigrants is 170,000 with a limitation of 20,000 to any 1 country, on a first come, first served basis.

There was no objection to this bill during hearings before the Committee on Rules, although there are differing views on how to accomplish the purposes of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 533.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

(Mr. SMITH of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, as explained by the able gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY], House Resolution 533 will make in order the consideration of H.R. 2580, an act amending the Immigration and Nationality Act under an open rule, with 5 hours of debate. The committee substitute will be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule.

To replace the quota system, a ceiling of 170,000 immigrants per year from non-Western Hemisphere nations is established. Of this total, no nation may have more than 20,000 places. Exempted from the need to qualify under the requirements placed on these immigrants are parents, spouses, and unmarried minor children of citizens. All others will be accepted on a preference basis which stresses the reuniting of families and the desire to accept professionally qualified individuals such as doctors, scientists, lawyers, artists, and so forth, and other workers skilled and unskilled, whose abilities are needed.

This selection system takes effect on July 1, 1968, when the national origins system is abolished.

Between the enactment of this bill and July 1, 1968, all unused visas will be placed in a pool to allow immigration from countries with oversubscribed quotas. These pool immigrants will be selected under the new preference rules and on July 1, 1968, with the end of the national origins system, the pool will be abolished and all immigrants will then

20774

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 24, 1965

enter under the preference lists of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, there is no ceiling on immigration from free Western Hemisphere nations and two new countries are added to that total—Jamaica and Trinidad-Tobago.

I expect that an amendment will be offered placing a reasonable ceiling, based upon immigration figures on such immigration.

Testimony before the Committee on Rules indicated how rapidly this immigration is growing. One witness stated that he expected to see in the near future as many as 200,000 per year if some reasonable and fair ceiling is not added.

We have placed such a ceiling on our friends in the rest of the world.

New labor controls are enacted which apply to all immigrants except relative preference and refugees.

The Secretary of Labor under the language in the bill will be required to make a finding in the case individually that immigrants will not take a job for which there is a willing American worker nor upset the wage scales in the area.

Finally, the bill provides that of the 170,000 immigrants, up to 10,200 may be refugees. Thus continuing our policy of accepting those fleeing oppression by totalitarian governments.

My understanding is that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGREGOR] will offer the amendment I have referred to in connection with the Western Hemisphere to place a maximum ceiling of 115,000 immigrants from these particular Western Hemisphere countries, such ceiling to be exclusive of immediate family members of citizens as is the ceiling for the Eastern Hemisphere.

Before the Rules Committee the testimony was rather joint at that time, the three distinguished gentlemen on the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] more or less testified jointly.

Mr. FEIGHAN read a 7-page statement to us which I personally think was excellent. I will not try to take the time to review it, but I would commend it to every Member or at least to listen to the gentleman's testimony as they present this particular bill.

Some of us, Mr. Speaker, like myself as an example, find ourselves in a rather peculiar position here today. Two years ago in the 88th Congress an immigration bill was offered which I read and studied and which I thought was very bad legislation. I so informed my organizations, and people and constituency and I opposed that legislation. The bill introduced originally in this particular Congress, the administration bill as it is so called, was in my opinion likewise as bad as the bill which was introduced in the last Congress. I mentioned my opposition at that time in the news releases and statements before chambers of commerce and other organizations. I now find in reading this particular bill somehow or other this seems to be a reversal. This bill is not much like the originally introduced bad bill I referred to.

Members will notice that the rule provides for substituting this bill as an amendment for the other bill. I believe, as the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PORR], said to me the other day, this is somewhat like having an automobile and then jacking it up and taking the motor and everything else off it, simply leaving the body or the name of the original, when we compare the difference between the administration bill and this bill.

In fact, I will have to say to the distinguished gentlemen that I am amazed they were able to get together and agree and to be so happy when they came before the Rules Committee.

Particularly I wish to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] who I know have worked extremely hard in trying to bring about this bill and present it to the House.

So far as I am concerned, I would be more than happy to have this bill go over until January, after the recess, so that I personally could go home to explain to my constituents why this bill, in my opinion, is a reasonably good bill; and, if the MacGregor amendment is adopted, with restrictions on the Western Hemisphere, I anticipate that I will vote for the bill.

This is a bill they wish to get through. They have asked for the rule. The rule is before the House today. I know of no objection to the rule.

I personally will support the MacGregor amendment, with regard to restrictions on the Western Hemisphere. I do not see any reason why we should not have restrictions. There has been some indication that we should not hurt the feelings of our friends, but America comes first. We ought to know how many people are coming in, if we are to change our immigration laws at the present time.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I commend the gentleman from California for a very excellent and precise statement covering the present content of the bill, H.R. 2580.

I also thank the gentleman for his references, which were entirely accurate, to the amendment which I will propose during the course of the debate.

This is an amendment which was proposed in the subcommittee and which was adopted in the subcommittee when the subcommittee members were registering their own independent judgments on the matter. But at the 11th hour and 59th minute before the subcommittee approved the bill, my amendment was defeated on a motion to reconsider.

The gentleman is entirely correct when he refers to the fact that without my amendment the bill would continue substantially as is the immigration patterns from the Western Hemisphere with the exception of the Caribbean area.

The gentleman did refer to Jamaica and to Trinidad-Tobago as being countries who will be placed in a highly favored position under the bill as it now

stands; yet it is urged that we put the lid on immigration from our allies such as the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany and other countries of Western Europe.

I should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that the bill as it now stands not only gives a highly preferential treatment to countries in the Caribbean which have recently acquired their independence but, if it is adopted, it would grant highly preferential treatment to all Caribbean countries which subsequently acquire their independence.

I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the country of British Guiana is certain to obtain independence in the near future. Negotiations with the United Kingdom to accomplish this end are nearly complete.

Second, the country of Barbados is expected by the United Kingdom to acquire independence soon.

Third, British Honduras wants to become independent and at the present time is initiating efforts to accomplish that status.

Further, I state to the House that each of these three countries has a heavily oversubscribed present list of those desiring to enter the United States.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I should like to propound a question which the gentleman from Minnesota might well answer.

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I ask the gentleman from Minnesota if it is not true that despite what the gentleman says with reference to what happened in the subcommittee, in the full committee his amendment was decisively beaten?

Mr. MACGREGOR. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, it was obvious that the executive branch had done its work effectively in the full committee, and the members toed the line as they were requested to do by the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. CELLER. I am sure the gentleman knows that the members of the Judiciary Committee, of which he is one, and an honored one, usually vote according to their conscience and the dictates of their judgment.

That is invariably a rule in our committee. I do not think we bow down to any so-called superior power.

Mr. MACGREGOR. May I say to the charming gentleman from New York that I would not impugn either his motives or those of the very distinguished gentleman who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration [Mr. FEIGHAN], nor those of anyone else. However, I simply recite the facts as they appear from the Record; namely, that when my motion was considered on its merits, it was adopted. Then subsequently, although the merits remained unchanged, some of the votes were switched.

The Immigration Act, H.R. 2580, makes significant progress in emphasizing our

August 24, 1965

20775

desire to reunite families. It would also sweep away any discrimination on account of race. Unfortunately, the bill would continue and even increase unequal treatment based upon national origin and geographic location. This anomaly is highlighted in the following editorial comment.

[From the New York Times, July 17, 1965]

PROGRESS ON IMMIGRATION

Secretary Rusk urges that Latin American nations remain outside any ceiling, as they are now outside of the quota system. But this well-intentioned position could lead to trouble and ill will in the not so distant future if immigration from Latin America and the Caribbean should grow sharply—as there are signs that it will—and pressure were then built up to limit a sudden flood of immigrants for which the country was unprepared. While the entire law is being overhauled, it would be better to place all the nations of the world, including those to the south of the United States, on exactly the same footing.

[From the Christian Science Monitor,
Aug. 17, 1965]

NEW WORLD IMMIGRATION

Applying intense pressure, the administration struck from the immigration reform bill a measure which many experts believe will have to be faced in the near future. This was a provision which would have placed a limit on migration into the United States from the rest of the New World.

Administration opposition centered on the claim that to impose such a limit would endanger diplomatic relations with several Latin American States. This seems like an inadequate excuse for several reasons. We find it hard to believe that any government believes its citizens have a right per se to migrate to any other country. In the second place, certain of the New World lands themselves place high hurdles before many U.S. citizens where immigration is concerned. Thus Mexico virtually demands that a newcomer, including one from the United States, be financially independent before going to Mexico to live, and there are signs that Canada unofficially discourages immigration of nonwhites, among them American Negroes.

But all such considerations aside, Washington must surely realize that, at any moment, it could face a deluge of would-be Latin American immigrants. The flood of Puerto Ricans which has poured into New York, and the wave of Jamaicans which has flowed into Britain during the last 15 years are but tokens of the vast numbers who might someday wish to leave underdeveloped homelands.

For two crucial facts must be faced. The first is that the population of Latin America is growing more rapidly than that of any other large area in the world. The second is that, on the whole, the Latin American nations are failing to solve their economic problems. Thus the pressure on resources grows and grows. Eventually Latin Americans from many lands may decide to do what Puerto Ricans and Mexicans have done in such large numbers: go to the United States.

It would seem that a reasonable, legal limit on migration from Latin America, if adopted today, could prevent the need to adopt more stringent legislation tomorrow.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star,
Aug. 24, 1965]

REVOLT BREWING ON IMMIGRATION

(By Charles Bartlett)

There are signs of revolt by the House of Representatives against the intermingling of immigration policy and short-term diplomacy in the stand taken by Secretary of State Dean Rusk on the new immigration bill.

Rusk is urging Congress to abolish the individual country quotas that have controlled migration to the United States since 1924. He echoes the widespread sentiment that these quotas are discriminatory and damaging to the Nation's reputation for fairness. But Rusk also urges that the Latin American republics continue to be excluded, as they have been since 1924, from the overall limitation that the new bill will place upon migration to this country.

Representative MICHAEL FEIGHAN, Democrat, of Ohio, leading the move to revamp immigration policy, has doggedly questioned the special access of Latin immigrants. Why is it fair, he has asked, for people all over the world to stand in line for quota numbers while South Americans enter the United States simply by showing that they are unlikely to become public charges?

Feighan hoped to end this special status in the new immigration law but he met objections from the State Department after the crisis erupted in the Dominican Republic. Rusk and Under Secretary of State Thomas Mann argued earnestly that this move would weaken the U.S. standing in Latin America at a critical moment. Further persuasions by President Johnson induced FEIGHAN to agree to a compromise.

The Feighan bill now before the House requires the President to notify Congress when immigrations from the Western Hemisphere start to rise sharply. Latin immigrants will be subject, like all others, to the Labor Department's certification that they possess needed skills not already available in the pool of unemployed.

But this compromise has not allayed the alarm of some members at demographers' projections that the population of South America will multiply in this century from 69 million to 600 million. The growth of Latin migrations to the United States in this decade from 95,701 in 1960 to 139,262 in 1964, has added substance to warnings that the time is ripe to erect a dam against a possible flood of immigrants.

The Latin political leaders, with a few exceptions, are so hesitant to acknowledge their population problems that a strong initiative by the Ecumenical Council will be necessary to prod them into a population control campaign. Most observers doubt that the council will produce a fulsome endorsement of birth control this fall. Meanwhile, about 700,000 Salvadorans have quietly overflowed into neighboring Honduras, and the Colombians talk of exporting masses of unemployed workers to Europe.

Representative CLARK MACGREGOR, Republican, of Minnesota, who proposes to establish an annual limit of 115,000 immigrants from the 24 nations of the Western Hemisphere, points out that the State Department merely wants to postpone the action. Rusk said during the hearings, "I am suggesting that Congress wait until there is a need to do it."

MACGREGOR argues that it will be wiser and more realistic to meet the problem during this reform of immigration policy than to wait until the crisis develops. Communists will maintain that the limitation is new evidence of Washington's detachment from the hemisphere's problem, but their charges will be softened by the present scope of this country's contributions to the Alliance for Progress.

Since most Latin Governments do not currently recognize their population problems, the imposition of a quota will provoke less diplomatic tension now than it will later when overpopulation becomes acute. Congress' enactment of the quota may actually jolt the Latins into more realistic attitudes.

The arguments for establishing the quotas now are so compelling and the diplomatic consequences are so nebulous that some Congressmen suspect that Rusk and Mann are resisting it purely in terms of diplomatic expediency. Their stand on immigration is certainly inconsistent with their refusal to endorse preferential trade arrangements within the Western Hemisphere.

The key virtue of the new immigration bill is that it has been drafted in a practical and unsentimental spirit of fairness toward all nations. The preferential treatment of South America cannot be maintained if the United States is to boast truthfully that its new policy does not put one nation or region ahead of another.

The Committee on the Judiciary is asking the House to place a numerical ceiling on immigrants from all countries outside the Western Hemisphere. Would it not also be fair and just to place Latin American and Caribbean area immigration under a reasonable ceiling?

In our foreign relations, does America want to convey the impression that the Scandinavians, the Germans, the Irish, the Italians, are less welcome here than someone else?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to hear the remarks of that able chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. CELLER], with whom I agree so much of the time. I agree with what he said, that is, that the members of the Committee on the Judiciary, as a whole, and almost without exception, vote in accordance with the dictates of their conscience. You know the members of this very hard working subcommittee voted in accordance with the dictates of their conscience and approved the MacGregor amendment in the subcommittee. Then, lo and behold, there was one of the quickest changes of conscience in order to change the result and the outcome of this amendment that I have seen in the many years that I have been on the Committee on the Judiciary. The gentleman from Minnesota has correctly explained the chronology of the events and the effect and the purport of his amendment which was adopted in the subcommittee.

20776

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 24, 1965

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF].

(Mr. POFF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter and tables.)

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, as a former member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, I was privileged to participate in a 2-year course of committee hearings devoted to population changes and other demographic phenomena in every geographic area of the world. I was particularly impressed with the dramatic population growth currently in progress and forecast for the foreseeable future in the Western Hemisphere and particularly in the nations of Central and South America.

Population pressures constitute the principal justification for an amendment to H.R. 2580 which will be offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor] placing a numerical ceiling on immigration from the Western Hemisphere. Accordingly, I have extracted from our subcommittee hearings a number of tables and other data bearing on the subject which I submit herewith for the Record in order that they may be available for study before the MacGregor amendment is offered.

CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICA

Central and South America have the highest rate of population increase in the world. In 1960 about 1 out of every 20 persons in the world's total population of 3 billion people lived in this area, including Panama. In 1900 only about 1 out of every 50 persons of the world was an inhabitant of Central or South America. It is predicted that 1 out of every 15 persons of the world's inhabitants will be either a Central American or a South American within the next few years.

Brazil has received the most immigrants; the largest number have come from Italy, second largest from Portugal, third from Spain and fourth from Japan. In fact, in the 1930's approximately 200,000 Japanese people, mostly farmers, emigrated to Brazil.

The descendants of those various nationality groups who are now natives of the Western Hemisphere are entitled to nonquota status. It, therefore, becomes very obvious that the conceivable emigration from the Western Hemisphere will flout the purpose of H.R. 2580, as amended, by allowing a disproportionate number of some ethnic groups to enter the United States unlimited.

In 1920 the world population having increased to 1.8 billion the inhabitants of South American numbered only 61 million or about 3.4 percent of the total, and the combined population of Central American countries and Panama came to 4.6 million or 0.3 percent of the people on the face of the earth. By 1950, however, when the earth's population had arisen to 2.5 billion, there were 111 million people in South America—4.4 percent of the world population—and another 8.7 million in the five Central American countries and Panama taken together.

TABLE 1.—Populations, densities, percent males engaged in agriculture, gross domestic product per head, and vital rates for areas in the Caribbean region

Area	Population, 1960	Density, persons per square mile, 1960	Percent males engaged in agriculture	Gross domestic product per head	Vital rates per 1,000, 1959-61 population		
					Birth rate	Death rate	Rate of natural increase
Republics:							
Cuba.....	6,797,000	150	47.1	US\$400	31		
Haiti.....	3,505,000	330	88.7		35-40		
Dominican Republic.....	2,994,000	160	76.4	230	42		
Total, Republics.....	13,296,000						
Other islands:							
Jamaica.....	1,609,800	370		350	41.2	9.3	32.2
Trinidad and Tobago.....	828,000	420	22.8	500	38.4	8.5	29.9
Barbados.....	232,300	1,400	26.4	280	31.1	9.5	21.6
Grenada.....	88,700	670	48.0	160	44.4	11.2	33.2
St. Lucia.....	86,100	370	59.4	160	47.8	14.7	33.1
St. Vincent.....	79,900	530	44.4	170	50.1	14.1	36.0
Dominica.....	59,800	200	58.5	180	45.0	13.9	31.1
St. Kitts-Nevis.....	56,700	370		180	41.0	12.6	28.4
Antigua.....	54,100	320		190	33.7	9.6	24.1
Montserrat.....	12,200	380		140	30.7	13.2	17.5
British Virgin Islands.....	7,900	120			37.0	9.6	27.4
Netherlands Antilles.....	190,000	510					
Martinique.....	277,000	650	51.8		38.1	9.5	28.6
Guadeloupe.....	270,000	390	54.1		38.7	9.8	28.9
Not classified.....	11,000						
Total, islands.....	3,863,600						
Mainland areas:							
British Honduras.....	90,500	10		210	44.8	8.0	36.8
British Guiana.....	560,400	6		270	43.7	10.7	33.0
French Guiana.....	31,000	1			31.5	13.8	17.7
Dutch Guiana.....	308,000	4			45.5	8.2	37.3
Total, mainland areas.....	989,900						
Total, Caribbean region.....	18,149,500						

NOTE.—Demographic material for the British areas is based on the 1960 census and on 1959-61 vital events. Corresponding material for other territories is the latest available in the United Nations Yearbooks.

TABLE II.—Absolute and relative increases of population in the countries of Central and South America, 1940-50 and 1950-60

Country	Number of inhabitants			Increase, 1940-50		Increase, 1950-60	
	1940	1950	1960	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Central America.....	7,318,071	8,678,573	11,768,541	1,360,502	19	3,089,968	36
Costa Rica.....	1,519,000	800,875	1,171,000	181,875	29	370,125	46
El Salvador.....	1,633,000	1,855,917	2,435,000	222,917	14	579,083	31
Guatemala.....	2,500,000	2,790,868	3,765,000	290,868	12	974,132	35
Honduras.....	1,107,859	1,368,605	1,845,000	260,746	24	476,395	35
Nicaragua.....	835,636	1,057,023	1,477,000	221,387	27	419,977	40
Panama.....	622,576	805,285	1,075,541	182,709	29	270,256	34
Spanish South America.....	46,381,506	65,964,093	70,947,491	9,582,587	21	14,983,398	27
Argentina.....	14,160,000	16,761,000	20,008,945	2,592,000	18	3,247,945	19
Bolivia.....	2,600,000	2,704,165	3,462,000	104,165	4	757,835	28
Chile.....	5,023,539	5,750,000	7,339,546	725,461	15	1,589,546	28
Colombia.....	9,090,000	11,300,000	14,132,000	2,210,000	24	2,832,000	25
Ecuador.....	2,600,000	3,202,757	4,317,000	602,757	23	1,114,243	35
Paraguay.....	1,111,000	1,341,333	1,768,000	230,333	21	426,667	32
Peru.....	6,207,967	7,820,000	10,120,000	1,512,033	26	2,300,000	29
Uruguay.....	1,870,000	2,050,000	2,600,000	180,000	10	550,000	27
Venezuela.....	3,710,000	5,034,838	7,200,000	1,324,838	36	2,165,162	43
Brazil.....	11,236,315	51,944,397	70,967,185	10,708,082	26	19,022,788	37
North:							
Acre.....	79,768	114,755	160,208	34,987	44	45,453	40
Amazonas.....	438,008	532,215	750,704	94,207	22	218,489	41
Pará.....	944,644	1,160,750	1,519,824	216,106	23	459,074	40
Northeast:							
Maranhão.....	1,235,169	1,583,248	2,492,139	348,079	28	908,891	57
Piauí.....	817,601	1,045,696	1,263,368	228,095	28	217,572	27
Ceará.....	2,091,032	2,695,450	3,337,855	604,418	29	642,406	24
Rio Grande do Norte.....	768,018	967,921	1,167,268	199,903	26	189,337	20
Paraíba.....	1,422,282	1,713,259	2,018,023	290,977	20	304,764	18
Pernambuco.....	2,688,240	3,395,185	4,135,900	706,945	26	741,715	22
Alagoas.....	951,800	1,093,137	1,271,062	141,837	15	177,925	16
Fernando do Noronha.....	0	581	1,389	581		808	139
East:							
Sergipe.....	542,326	644,361	760,273	102,035	19	115,912	18
Bahia.....	3,918,112	4,834,575	5,990,605	916,463	23	1,159,030	24
Minas Gerais.....	6,736,416	7,717,792	9,798,890	981,376	15	2,081,088	27
Serra dos Aimores.....	66,994	160,072	384,297	93,078	166	224,225	140
Espirito Santo.....	750,107	851,562	1,188,665	111,455	15	327,103	38
Rio de Janeiro.....	1,847,857	2,297,194	3,402,728	449,337	24	1,105,534	48
Guanabara.....	1,764,141	2,377,451	2,307,163	613,310	35	929,712	39
South:							
São Paulo.....	7,180,316	9,134,423	12,974,699	1,954,107	27	3,840,276	42
Paraná.....	1,238,276	2,115,547	4,277,733	879,277	71	2,162,216	102
Santa Catarina.....	1,178,340	1,550,502	2,146,909	382,162	32	585,407	39
Rio Grande do Sul.....	3,320,689	4,164,821	5,448,823	844,182	25	1,284,002	21
West central:							
Mato Grosso.....	432,265	558,979	981,045	126,714	29	422,066	76
Goiás.....	828,414	1,214,921	2,096,604	388,507	47	881,683	73

Footnotes on following page.

August 24, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

20777

¹ United Nations estimate.² Author's estimate.³ Territory.⁴ Data for Amazonas include those for the territory of Rio Branco which was separated from it subsequent to the 1940 census.⁵ Data for Pará include those for the territory of Amapá which was separated from it subsequent to the 1940 census.⁶ Area in dispute between the States of Espírito Santo and Minas Gerais.⁷ Data for Mato Grosso include those for the territory of Rondonia which was separated from it subsequent to the 1940 census.⁸ The 1960 data for Goiás include the 141,742 residents of the New Federal District (Brasília) created after 1950 from territory formerly constituting a part of Goiás.

On the basis of the data presented in tables I and II, one is forced to the conclusion that present rates of population increase in Central and South America must average at least 3 percent per annum, and that they may even run as high as 3.3 or 3.4 percent per year. A rate of growth of 3 percent per annum is extremely high. Prior to this recent development in South America never throughout human history has the population of an entire continent increased at such a pace. As a matter of fact, it is probable that the United States between 1790 and 1860, when the rate of growth was running about 3.2 percent per year, is the only large nation that previously has experienced such rapid increases of population.

CONCLUSION

First. The Central American and South American countries taken together make up the great world subdivision in which the population is increasing most rapidly. This was true during the second quarter of the 20th century, it was also true for the decade 1950-1960, and it remains true during the 1960's.

Second. As yet there is no tendency for the rates of growth of these populations to exhibit any tendency to decline. Instead, the rates for the decade 1950-1960 actually were considerably higher than the phenomenally high ones that prevailed between 1940 and 1950.

Third. No other large nation in the world, except the United States during the period between 1790 and 1860, has ever experienced rates of population growth equal to the 3.0 percent per annum or more currently prevailing in Brazil and in most of the Spanish American countries under consideration.

Fourth. Between 1920 and 1960 the proportion of Central and South Americans in the total population of the earth mounted from about 3.7 percent to approximately 5.1 percent.

Fifth. Although the South American Continent contains a major portion of the earth's lands which remain largely unsettled and unused even though they are capable of maintaining large populations, very little of the phenomenal increases of population on that continent is taking place in newly opened agricultural areas. In South America, and in Central America as well, the conquest of the tropics still remains a task for the future.

Sixth. The recent large and significant increases of population in Central and South America are occurring for the most part in and immediately about the major cities of those areas. This, in turn we may add is due largely to migrations from the rural areas to the urban centers and to the broad bands of misery, or slums, which surround most of them.

MEXICO

The 1960 census reported that Mexico had 35 million inhabitants. The population of Mexico increased by 35.4 percent during the decade 1950 to 1960 or an average annual rate of 3.5 percent. During the 20-year period from 1940 to 1960, the population of Mexico increased by 78 percent. More than 15 million inhabitants were added to 19.7 million who were recorded in 1940.

According to the 1960 census only six-tenths of 1 percent of the population of Mexico were foreign born—the rest were all native born. The birth rate is maintained at a high level and in contrast the death rate has been rapidly declining from 19.1 percent in 1946 to 11.6 percent in 1962. This accounts for the large natural increase. In 1960 alone the natural increase was approximately 33.9 percent.

Whether Mexico can absorb this rapid increase will depend upon the economic production and ways of making a living. At the present time the gross national product of Mexico is increasing at a level with the population increase. Whether this will continue is a very serious question.

By and large the emigration from Mexico to the United States was prompted by socioeconomic reasons.

Over the years, there has been a rather continuous immigration of Mexicans to the United States. According to the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, there were 400,263 alien immigrants admitted from Mexico during the 10-year period 1953-62. This gives an average of about 40,000 persons per year. The largest number admitted during any one year was 65,047 in 1956; the smallest was 18,454 in 1953.

POPULATION TRENDS IN MEXICO

(By Dr. Nathan L. Whetten, University of Connecticut)

Mexico has about 35 million inhabitants. This is more than is found in any other nation in the Western Hemisphere with the exceptions of the United States and Brazil. Argentina has only 20 million, Canada 18, Colombia 14, Peru 11, Venezuela 7.5, and Chile 7.3 million inhabitants. Brazil has 71 million people but no other Latin American country, except those mentioned above, has as many as 7 million. Thus, from the standpoint of both proximity to the United States and the size of her population, Mexico deserves attention as one of the most important countries in the Western Hemisphere.

Mexico is surpassed in the size of its land area by the United States, Canada, Brazil, and Argentina; but its density of population, 17.3 persons per square kilometer, is greater than that found in any of these larger countries except the United States which is only slightly more dense with 19. Many of the smaller countries in Central America and the Caribbean Islands, however, are much more densely populated than any of these large five.

MIGRATION TO THE UNITED STATES

Over the years there has been a rather continuous immigration of Mexicans to the United States. According to the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, there were 400,263 alien immigrants admitted from Mexico during the 10-year period 1953-62. This gives an average of about 40,000 persons per year. The largest number admitted during any one year was 65,047 in 1956; the smallest was 18,454 in 1953. In 1962, 55,291 were admitted. During the 8-year period from 1950 to 1957, there were 7,454 aliens (former immigrants) who emigrated to Mexico from the United States, or an average of 932 persons per year. Statistics on former immigrants returning to Mexico (emigrating) from the United States have not been collected since 1957. Ever since the beginning of the century Mexico has been a country of emigration rather than one of immigration partly because of the scarcity of good farmland, widespread poverty, and limited opportunities for employment.

Some indication of the impact of Mexican immigration on the United States may be derived from the U.S. census data, which indicate that there were 575,902 persons living in the United States in 1960 who were born in Mexico. These constituted 5.9 percent of the total foreign born. The inhabitants of Mexican birth are concentrated in a few States mostly in the Southwest along the Mexican border. The largest numbers, by far, are found in California with 248,542, and Texas with 202,315. These two States combined account for 78.3 percent of all persons of Mexican birth in the United States. It is interesting to note that only 7.3 percent of all persons born in Mexico were living in States outside of the seven listed in table 8. Although comparatively few persons of Mexican birth are living in Arizona and New Mexico, they constitute half of the total foreign born of these two States. In Texas more than two-thirds of all the foreign born were born in Mexico.

TABLE 12.—Crude birth rates, death rates, and natural increase in Mexico, 1946-60¹

Year	Crude birth rate	Crude death rate	Natural increase
1946.....	42.9	19.1	23.8
1947.....	43.3	16.4	26.9
1948.....	44.6	16.7	27.9
1949.....	44.7	17.8	27.1
1950.....	45.5	16.2	29.3
1951.....	44.6	17.3	27.3
1952.....	43.8	16.0	28.8
1953.....	46.0	16.9	29.1
1954.....	46.4	13.1	33.3
1955.....	46.4	13.7	32.7
1956.....	46.8	12.1	34.7
1957.....	47.3	13.2	34.1
1958.....	44.5	12.5	32.0
1959.....	47.7	11.9	35.8
1960.....	45.5	11.6	33.9

¹ Data from "Dirección General de Estadística."

CONCLUSIONS

Briefly summarizing, then, the following conclusions seem to be warranted:

1. Mexico's population has been increasing at an exceptionally rapid rate in recent years.

2. The birth rate has remained fairly stable at a high rate for a long time. The death rate has been rapidly declining. There have been no large waves of immigration into Mexico in the recent past; hence it seems valid to assume that the population increase is due primarily to natural increases or the increasingly growing surplus of births over deaths.

3. There are signs that differential fertility is developing among the inhabitants of the larger cities compared with the rural areas.

20778

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 24, 1965

Thus, cities with over 50,000 inhabitants have a lower fertility index than the rural population. How fast and how far fertility will decline as industrialization proceeds is uncertain.

4. It seems unlikely that the death rate will continue to decline as rapidly as in the recent past without drastic improvement in the levels of living of the lower classes.

5. If both the birth rate and the death rate remain at somewhere near their present levels, Mexico can look toward continued rapid increase of her population.

6. Internal migration and shifting of population is likely to become accelerated in the future. Most Mexicans are born in the villages and small towns of the nation. There simply is not enough farmland to support them in the rural districts. Most of the agrarian communities (ejidos) have insufficient land to provide an adequate living for the present population. Therefore, the sur-

plus of population resulting from high birth rates has no alternative but to migrate elsewhere.

7. Massive migration to the cities will further complicate the housing and living conditions of the city slums into which many of the migrants finally settle down. Only through gigantic housing projects can this situation be alleviated.

8. Immigration to the United States and the bracero movement have served in the past as safety valves for thousands of Mexicans determined to improve their socio-economic positions. These movements have probably served also to establish and strengthen bonds of friendly feeling toward the United States on the part of relatives, friends, and neighbors of the international migrants.

9. Assuming that the population will continue to increase rapidly in the near future, the seriousness of the problems engendered

will depend greatly on two major considerations:

(a) The extent to which economic development can keep pace with the expanding population. The increase in economic productivity during the past 20 years has been little short of spectacular. Whether or not this can be expected to continue indefinitely is an open question.

CARIBBEAN

There is a very real shortage of skilled workers in this area in spite of the fact the area is overpopulated; this shortage of skilled workers has been aggravated by migration to the United Kingdom. By virtue of the Commonwealth Immigration Act of 1962, immigration outlets which existed for the West Indies have been removed and thus the population growth is now becoming explosive.

TABLE 8.—Population movements in British Caribbean Islands, 1921-1960

Island	Census populations			Intercensal increase				Natural increase				Migration balance			
	1921	1946	1960	Annual increments		Rates of increase (percent)		Annual increments		Annual rate of increase (percent)		Annual average movement		Movement as percent of natural increase	
				1921-46	1946-60	1921-46	1946-60	1921-46	1946-60	1921-46	1946-60	1921-46	1946-60	1921-46	1946-60
Barbados	156,800	192,800	232,300	1,450	2,800	0.84	1.34	1,550	4,150	0.89	1.95	-100	-1,350	-6.5	-32.5
Jamaica	858,100	1,321,100	1,608,800	17,250	21,900	1.87	1.58	16,050	32,900	1.53	2.31	+1,200	-11,000	+7.5	-33.4
Antigua	29,800	41,800	54,100	500	900	1.35	1.88	450	1,150	1.26	2.40	+50	-250	+11.1	-21.7
Montserrat	12,100	14,300	12,200	100	-150	.87	-1.18	250	250	1.80	1.80	-150	-400	-60.0	-160.0
St. Kitts-Nevis	38,200	46,200	56,700	300	740	.78	1.47	450	1,300	1.07	2.53	-150	-550	-38.3	-42.3
Trinidad and Tobago	385,900	658,000	828,000	7,700	19,300	1.70	2.86	6,650	18,700	1.44	2.70	+1,050	+600	+15.8	+3.2
Dominica	37,100	47,600	59,900	400	900	1.00	1.86	650	1,300	1.53	2.42	-250	-400	-38.5	-30.8
Grenada	66,800	72,400	88,700	250	1,150	.36	1.46	1,200	2,250	1.73	2.79	-960	-1,100	-79.2	-48.9
St. Lucia	51,600	70,010	86,100	750	1,150	1.24	1.48	1,000	2,000	1.94	2.56	-250	-850	-25.0	-42.5
St. Vincent	44,400	61,000	79,900	700	1,300	1.32	1.88	1,150	2,150	2.17	3.04	-450	-850	-39.1	-39.6
All islands	1,660,200	2,426,900	3,107,700	29,400	50,000	1.52	1.78	29,400	66,150	1.45	2.30	-16,150	-16,150	-24.4	-24.4

NOTE.—Where estimates of movements during 1946-60 are based on provisional tabulations of births and deaths they are subject to slight revision.

TABLE 9.—Annual net migration and annual natural increase for Jamaica and Barbados, 1881-1960

Period	Annual net emigration (-) or immigration (+)	Annual natural increase	Col. (A) as to col. (B)	Period	Annual net emigration (-) or immigration (+)	Annual natural increase	Col. (A) as to col. (B)
(A)	(B)			(A)	(B)		
Jamaica:				Barbados:			
1881-91	-2,500	8,300	-30.1	1881-91	-800	(1)	-125.0
1891-1911	-2,200	11,800	-18.6	1891-1911	-2,500	2,000	-266.7
1911-21	-7,700	10,400	-74.0	1911-21	-2,400	900	-6.7
1921-43	+1,200	16,100	+7.5	1921-46	-100	1,500	-39.1
1943-60	-11,600	33,300	-34.8	1943-60	-1,300	4,100	-31.7

* Not available.

NOTE.—These estimates are taken from George W. Roberts, "The Population of Jamaica," Cambridge, 1957, and "Emigration from the Island of Barbados," Social and Economic Studies, vol. 4, No. 3, September 1955.

BARBADOS

If the growth continues at the rate of 1.3 percent per annum, this island of 166 square miles will, within the span of

190 years—less than six generations—attain a level of standing room only. This means literally 3 square yards per person. Over the entire region the annual

rate of natural increase, that is, birth rate less the death rate, stands at 2.5 percent which signifies a doubling within a period of 28 years.

August 24, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

20779

TABLE 1.—Populations, densities, percent males engaged in agriculture, gross domestic product per head, and vital rates for areas in the Caribbean region

Area	Population, 1960	Density, persons per square mile, 1960	Percent males engaged in agriculture	Gross domestic product per head	Vital rates per 1,000, 1959-61 population		
					Birth rate	Death rate	Rate of natural increase
Republics:							
Cuba.....	6,797,000	150	47.1	US\$400	31.0		
Haiti.....	3,505,000	330	88.7		35.0-40.0		
Dominican Republic.....	2,004,000	160	76.4	230	42.0		
Total, Republics.....	13,296,000						
Other islands:							
Jamaica.....	1,609,800	370		350	41.2	9.8	32.2
Trinidad and Tobago.....	828,000	420	22.8	500	38.4	8.5	29.9
Barbados.....	232,300	1,400	26.4	280	31.1	9.5	21.6
Grenada.....	88,700	670	48.0	160	44.4	11.2	33.2
St. Lucia.....	88,100	370	59.4	160	47.8	14.7	33.1
St. Vincent.....	79,900	530	44.4	170	50.1	14.1	36.0
Dominica.....	59,900	200	58.5	180	45.0	18.9	13.1
St. Kitts-Nevis.....	55,700	370		180	41.0	12.6	28.4
Antigua.....	54,100	320		190	33.7	9.6	24.1
Montserrat.....	12,200	380		140	30.7	15.2	17.5
British Virgin Islands.....	7,900	120			37.0	9.6	27.4
Netherlands Antilles.....	190,000	510					
Martinique.....	277,000	660	51.8		38.1	9.5	28.6
Guadeloupe.....	270,000	890	54.1		38.7	9.8	28.9
Not classified.....	11,000						
Total, Islands.....	3,863,600						
Mainland areas:							
British Honduras.....	90,500	10		210	44.8	8.0	36.8
British Guiana.....	560,400	6		270	43.7	10.7	33.0
French Guiana.....	31,000	1			31.5	13.8	17.7
Dutch Guiana.....	308,000	4			45.5	8.2	37.3
Total, mainland areas.....	989,900						
Total, Caribbean region.....	18,149,500						

Note.—Demographic material for the British areas is based on the 1960 census and on 1959-61 vital events. Corresponding material for other territories is the latest available in the United Nations Yearbooks.

TABLE 10.—Estimated future population to 1970 for some Caribbean areas
(In millions)

Population	1960	1965	1970	Increase, 1960-70
Cuba.....	6.80	7.61	8.54	1.74
Dominican Republic.....	2.99	3.06	3.44	.45
Haiti.....	3.60	3.88	4.28	.78
All British islands.....	3.12	3.65	4.07	.95
French islands.....	.55	.62	.69	.14
Netherlands Antilles.....	.20	.23	.29	.06
Total islands.....	17.16	19.05	21.28	4.12
British Honduras and British Guiana.....	.65	.76	.89	.24

Note.—Estimates for Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, and the Netherlands Antilles are the medium assumption estimates of the United Nations ("The Future Growth of the World Population," United Nations, 1958, ST/BOA/Series A28). Those for the British islands, British Guiana, and British Honduras are from "The Demographic Problems of the Area Served by the Caribbean Commission," 1957. Those for the French islands are based on the fertility of these islands and on the mortality of the British areas.

CANADA

Canada, with territory slightly larger than continental United States, in the 1961 census had over 18 million people. Thus, Canada had one-tenth of the population of the United States and the greatest part thereof along the U.S. border.

The most important early movement across the border to the United States was that of European immigrants who had come to Canada as a kind of stepping point on their way to the United States when the United States had an open immigration policy. When the U.S. border became more difficult to cross for people born in Europe, they tended to stay in Canada.

Between 1951 and 1961 there was a total of 462,000 emigrants from Canada to the United States.

The affect of a generous U.S. immigration policy is not wholly advantageous to the countries from which immigrants come. It does not really solve the population problem or the employment problem nor does it have any great bearing on such problems, that it tends to select the better educated citizens, which sort of immigration may even accentuate Canadian unemployment. Canada's population is increasing at approximately 2½ percent a year which is a little faster than the U.S. rate of increase.

During the last three decades (1931 to 1961) the Canadian labor force increased by 58 percent, while the total population of Canada increased by 76 percent.

Unemployment is the most serious and challenging problem Canada has had to face in the last few years. One of the most critical aspects of unemployment in Canada is the persistent disequilibrium between the technical qualifications of the young men entering the labor force on the one hand and the requirements of the industrializing society on the other.

Immigrants who have come to the United States from Europe have tended to stay and emigration has been proportionately small. The Canadian picture is more complex. At the same time that people were entering Canada from across the Atlantic, others were leaving for the United States; statistics show that about the same number entered Canada as were leaving. In 1961 recorded figures were 11,516 American residents coming to settle in Canada and 47,470 Canadian residents moving into the United States. To complicate matters, approximately 6,250

Canadian born persons who had come to the United States to settle returned to Canada.

The movement from Europe to the United States through Canada has been a source of considerable complaint in Canada.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any further requests for time, but I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL].

(Mr. ROSENTHAL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, four Presidents of the United States have urged changes in our immigration and naturalization procedures. They and the greater number of American citizens have demanded the elimination of the discriminatory national origins system. Many have pointed out the irrationalities of the preference priorities within the existing system. Still others have brought attention to the need for an immigration policy which seizes the opportunity of finding new skills from foreign-born citizens.

All these issues, and many more, can be resolved by our swift passage of H.R. 2580, legislation which has been on the national agenda for many years. In so acting, we will be eliminating archaic and unethical procedures which have done much to discredit this country in the eyes of the world, and particularly in the eyes of those abroad whose wish is to take up American citizenship.

E0780

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

August 24, 1965

Immigrants to Canada, 1957-61, by former country of residence in order of numerical importance in 1961

Country	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961
Italy	27,740	27,043	25,655	20,681	14,161
British Isles	106,989	24,777	18,222	10,585	11,870
United States	11,008	10,846	11,338	11,247	11,616
Germany	28,430	18,888	10,423	10,774	6,231
Other Commonwealth	6,919	6,577	6,237	5,446	4,601
Greece	5,460	5,190	4,867	4,866	3,766
Portugal	4,423	1,938	4,080	5,023	2,782
Poland	690	2,292	3,470	2,668	2,391
France	5,869	2,727	2,183	2,944	2,330
Netherlands	11,934	7,420	5,243	5,429	1,787
South America ¹	2,183	1,980	1,565	1,666	1,138
Austria	5,714	4,544	1,510	2,038	1,131
Belgium	3,009	1,770	1,471	1,282	1,013
Yugoslavia	1,048	684	958	881	852
Africa ²	2,330	1,066	505	657	838
Other Europe ¹	956	509	598	930	806
Switzerland	1,800	1,024	885	1,048	805
Japan	482	531	1,490	1,532	652
Other Middle East ¹	989	683	733	583	548
Denmark	7,683	1,746	1,359	1,115	475
Ireland	5,858	1,226	815	709	415
Finland	2,684	1,177	845	964	339
Other Scandinavian	2,492	678	786	711	329
Hungary	31,043	2,382	589	507	287
Asia ¹	1,119	1,188	779	395	270
Other North America ¹	243	284	255	273	263
Other	64	74	87	77	113
Total	232,164	124,851	106,928	104,111	71,689

¹Excluding Commonwealth countries.

²Including Republic of South Africa.

We will, for example, do away with a system which implies that people from one country are somehow more desirable than people from another. We will be able to replace such procedures with a formula which allows the transfer of unfilled quotas to oversubscribed countries. We will be able to establish a preference priority system which is responsive to the many difficult cases where families are separated on account of inflexible statutes and administration. Likewise will a revised immigration policy allow us to make naturalization procedures directly responsive to labor needs and requirements.

Two real purposes are being served by such legislation. On the one hand, we are taking direct steps to eliminate injustices, to set right unethical practices, to replace insensitivity and discrimination with concern and equity. This is symbolized by the abolition of the national origins system and the Asia-Pacific triangle provisions.

On the other hand, we are injecting reason and convenience into procedures which have been the victims of disordered formulas and reactionary administration. Thus, for example, we will be setting a limitation of 170,000 on the number of immigrants to be admitted to the United States in any 1 year, and will be placing ceilings of 20,000 on immigration from any one foreign country in any 1 year. Thus also will we construct a system of priorities which will be responsive to the claims of family, by giving first preference to unmarried adult children of American citizens and spouses and unmarried children of alien residents. This new selection system will be based upon a principle of first come, first served.

Up to now, our immigration policy has been inconsistent with our own democratic past, and destructive of future interests and obligations. It has compromised our foreign policy by its discriminatory provisions. The new program, which has had the careful and deliberate attention of experts in the executive

branch and in the Congress, will return to naturalization procedures the sense of fairness, opportunity, and national pride which lies at the root of this Nation of immigrants.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the Judiciary Committee for reporting to the Congress this long delayed legislation on modernizing our immigration laws. The subcommittee under Chairman FEIGHAN held hearings and also devoted long hours in executive session to submit a satisfactory bill to the full Judiciary Committee. This legislation was reported out by the Judiciary Committee by a nonpartisan vote of 27 to 4.

Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and now President Johnson, have urged the Congress on several occasions to enact reform legislation and abolish the national origins provision.

The No. 1 feature in the pending legislation has been the provision which will abolish the national origins section and give all nations an equal and pro rata status before our Federal laws on immigration. The great message that this bill will send to other nations is that our immigration laws will not, in the future, be contingent upon the question "In what country were you born?"

Our Nation became the leader of the world by reason of the amalgamation of immigrants from all nations and races throughout the globe. This legislation will not in any way let the bars down indiscriminately to people of every nation to successfully knock at our door demanding admission and citizenry. The bill would place all nations outside the Western Hemisphere on a population pro rata, equal footing with added provision that immigration from a single country could not exceed 20,000 per year. Western Hemisphere nations would be exempt

from the 20,000 and so would the spouses, children, and parents of U.S. citizens living in many countries.

The bill sets up a system of provisions in broad categories:

First. Close relatives of U.S. citizens.

Second. Scientists, artists, and other professions.

Third. Workers needed who fall into specific labor shortages.

Fourth. Refugees from communism.

Many people have been led to believe that the present existing national origins quota system has been a rockbound, foolproof mechanism to regulate immigration into the United States. It has not worked out that way in practical application concerning immigration in the past.

Fifteen years ago, nonquota immigration had equaled quota immigration. The quota system had been in actual practice for 25 years. During the past 15 years, nonquota immigration increased to the point that it has now doubled quota immigration. This trend will be curtailed by the passage of this legislation. Immigration into the United States has indeed been generous since World War II and the system has not been working for the best interest of the United States. We have been admitting 300,000 immigrants for the past 10 years and this situation has been brought about, indirectly, by enacting over 10 separate pieces of immigration legislation during the past 12 years.

The quota system has been indeed outmoded and this bill will permit selective immigration admissions. This bill will allow 170,000 immigrants per year exclusive of spouses, children, and parents of U.S. citizens from countries outside the Western Hemisphere and includes 10,200 refugees a year.

In abolishing the national quota system, this legislation used as its guidepost family unification. Spouses, children, and parents of U.S. citizens come first and there is no numerical limit placed on their admissions. The other preferences flow in this order—20 percent to unmarried children over 21 years of age of U.S. citizens; 20 percent to spouses and unmarried sons and daughters of permanent resident aliens; 10 percent to persons who are members of the professions and who because of their exceptional ability in the sciences and the arts will substantially benefit the national economy, cultural interests, or welfare of the United States; 10 percent to married sons or married daughters of U.S. citizens; 24 percent to brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens; 10 percent to persons who are capable of performing specified skilled or unskilled labor, not of temporary or seasonal nature, for which there is a demonstrated shortage of employable and willing workers in the United States; 6 percent to refugees who are victims of Communist or other totalitarian persecution, under procedures wherein U.S. officials are in exclusive control from start to finish.

The latter provision means that an applicant does not have to prove that he will be subjected to physical torture or to the death chamber if forced to return to his native land.

August 24, 1965

The present law is a mixture of laws and regulations that renders the enforcement complex and cumbersome. The department is fortunate to have a career commissioner, Raymond Farrell, 25 years service—who has made a great record as head of the Immigration Department.

New labor controls are established on the admission of all immigrant worker classes. These new controls require the Secretary of Labor to make an affirmative finding on an individual case basis. The job the immigrant worker will fill in the locality to which he is destined must be one where there is no willing, qualified, and available American worker.

The Secretary of Labor must also find that the admission of such immigrant workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers similarly employed in the United States. The new labor controls are mandatory for all immigrants except the relative preference classes and the limited number of refugees. These new labor controls were recommended by the AFL-CIO and have the strong support of labor.

I do think this legislation, if enacted into law, sets out major changes which will be the answer to our troublesome immigration problems and discriminations in past years against friendly nations and friendly people. Testimony given by our Secretary of State and two Attorney Generals revealed that the outmoded quota system has done untold damages in our foreign relations with certain friendly countries because of implied favoritism for the nations of some countries as against the citizens of other countries seeking entrance to our great and free land.

I hope the Congress enacts this immigration legislation without any major amendments.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. CELLER.]

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the main thrust of this bill is the nullifying of the so-called national-origins theory of immigration. That theory has been in our statutes commencing in 1921. It is an antiquated immigration system proven to be unworkable and unscientific. It was devised right after World War I as a result of the atmosphere of fear and trepidation bordering on hysteria, a direct result of the unsettled domestic and foreign affairs conditions following that holocaust of World War I.

It was based upon the belief that the place of birth or racial origin of a human being determines the quality or the level of a man's intellect, his moral character or his suitability for assimilation in our Nation or in our society. Criticisms against the national-origins theory have been wide and deep ever since it was adopted. Historians, social philosophers, demographers, anthropologists, all have pointed out its fallacies. In my book, and I am sure in your book, you judge a man by his worth and not by his birth.

We honor the uniqueness of a man, the boundaries of his mind and his soul, not

the geographical boundaries of his place of birth.

The bill cures the evil of judging a man by his place of birth rather than his inherent worth.

I ask this question: Are decency, integrity, talent, and genius confined within geographical boundaries? Of course the answer is "No." Otherwise how then do you account for a Fermi, a Leonardo da Vinci, a Rembrandt, a Paderewski, an Einstein, a Kossuth, a Masaryk, a Sibelius, a Freud, a Lope de Vega, or an El Greco?

I repeat, decency, integrity, talent, and genius are not the exclusive product of any one country or any one race.

Mr. Speaker, I remember the debates over the years, and those who argued for the principle of national origins and who spoke of the better talent and the better blood of certain races. I say to them, and I say to you if you prater to me of your own blood, I say take your blood to the marketplace and see what it will buy you. One man's blood is as good as another's.

Mr. Speaker, I did not know my grandfather too well. He came from Germany. I am not so much interested in my grandfather. I am more interested in my grandfather's grandson and what he has accomplished and what he intends to do.

Mr. Speaker, as far as ancestors are concerned, I will say they are like turnips—like turnips—nothing good of them but what is in the ground. We are not interested so much in what is in the ground. We are interested in what is above the ground. We are interested in those people who are alive today and who can contribute so much to the weal and the welfare of their Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I inveighed against this national origins theory a way back in 1924. I made a speech then against this theory. I am glad I am living today and have lived to see that my theories have been vindicated, that we are now to obliterate and nullify and cancel out this admonition called the national theory of immigration.

I then said, Mr. Speaker, and I should like to read to the Members of the House precisely what I said in 1924:

Let us at least be truthful. In fact, deception is futile. It is as clear as the sun that the majority of the Immigration Committee and most proponents of this measure like the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Tincher], who blurted out his true feelings while talking on the bill, do not want the "wops," "dagoes," "Hebrews," "hunkies," "bolls," and others known by similar epithets. Just so, in 1840, 1850, and 1860, you did not want the "beery Germans" and "dirty Irish." The Germans and Irish were mongrels, self-seekers, disreputable, and would not assimilate. We know now how good a citizenry they have become.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I went on to say that those against whom you are now speaking will become just as good as the Irish, just as good as the Englishman, and just as good as the German.

In my book called "You Never Leave Brooklyn" I repeated the scene in the House way back in 1924 during the

heated, emotional immigration debate. I quote from my remarks:

They [the Members of the House] listened, but did not hear. "The southern Europeans are Bolsheviks," Members repeated over and over and over again. They were talking about the Slavs and the Poles and the Italians—the people I knew. I had lived with them, gone to school with them, worked with them. They were the people of courage who had left the security of the past and took the brave journey to America with hope for themselves and their children; who had worked to make America richer, creating new industries and new jobs. They were the people who brought their diverse cultures so that the bloodstream of America coursed with greater vigor in the arts, in the sciences, and in the skills of mankind.

As I reread in 1962 the words I spoke in 1924, I grew heartsick to know that there are passages in the 1924 immigration debate I had only to lift out to apply them to the immigration debate of 1952:

"The war and the present postwar period, both redolent with hysteria, offer the worst possible background for reasoning out the immigration problem. As a result of the ordeal of the war we are still hysterical about immigration. The ultra-restrictionist and those behind the Johnson bill claim we are a disunited people. 'Nothing is further from the truth. The war proved that of all nations in the combat we were the most united. We were successful in welding our many peoples without the use of force or coercion. The methods embodied in the Johnson bill are the forceful methods used by Germany to assimilate her people. We know what ill success attended upon Germany's efforts. It is almost inconceivable that we should be adopting the futile German method.'

"As year followed year I came to realize that the Immigration Act was not the work of a group of men apart from the people. It was a product of the temper of the times. It was the same temper which had rejected Wilson and the League of Nations. We, generally, were tired—tired of foreign entanglements. Like children who had been asked to do something for which they were not ready, we wanted to pick up our marbles and go home. The angry quarrels of Europe, the division among its peoples, the never-ending Balkan jealousies, the diplomatic game to make and keep balances of power, represented to the United States a quarrelsome, dangerous, ill-bred family that we did not want to join. We were asking to be children just a little while longer. We expressed this wish in isolationism, in irritability, in the high tariff, in the immigration law of 1917, and in uncurbed credits and real estate booms. It takes a long time to grow up."

These words are as fresh and appropriate today as when they were first uttered.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN McCORMACK, be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include the first speech he made in the House of Representatives nearly 38 years ago as a new Member, against the national-origins clause.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the speech follows:

MR. McCORMACK'S MAIDEN SPEECH, FEBRUARY 14, 1929.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

20782

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 24, 1965

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the subject that I am going to discuss is quite different from the full and able speech which has just been rendered by the distinguished Member [Mr. GARNER] who has just preceded me, and which I found very interesting. I might say in passing that I have listened to the gentleman on two different occasions and his profound knowledge of the subject that he has discussed has made a marked impression upon me.

One of the most important questions remaining to be determined before this session of Congress is over is what action will be taken from the repeal, deference, or going into operation of the national-origins clause of the immigration law of 1924. The interest in this question is not confined to any one section of our country; neither is it confined to any one of the so-called nationals that constitute our inhabitants. The action of Congress on this question is being watched closely.

At the outset it must be borne in mind that the controversy over the national-origins clause of the immigration act has been misrepresented so as to be made to appear a controversy over increasing or decreasing numerically the number of immigrants that can come to this country. This misrepresentation is very unfortunate because it gives a false statement of facts. The repeal of the national-origins clause has nothing to do with the question of the number of people that shall be permitted to come here each year. The effort to repeal the national-origins clause has been characterized as an attack upon the immigration law of 1924. It is nothing of the kind. It is, in fact, an effort to prevent the law from being ridiculous.

The national-origins clause is a part of the immigration law of 1924. Nobody seems to know its real parenthood, although one John B. Trevor, of New York City, who was a captain in the Intelligence Department of the Army, detailed in New York City during the war, appears to claim the credit for it.

I have heard that the Ku-Klux Klan claims the credit for conceiving it and securing its adoption as an amendment to the immigration law. I am satisfied, however, that their only knowledge of it was after its adoption in the Senate in 1924, as an amendment to the bill that passed the House, and that thereafter the Ku-Klux Klan used it as a means of trying to carry out its purposes by attracting additional members to its ranks. It seems rather hard for me to believe that anything that such an organization might sponsor would receive the favorable consideration of either or both branches of Congress.

It appears from the records of the hearings of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization which reported the 1924 immigration law that the national-origins clause received little, if any, consideration from the committee. It is quite probable—and so far as I can find it is a fact—that it was not presented to the committee for consideration. In any event, when the bill was reported to the House it was not a part thereof, and during debate an amendment was offered in the House which included in substance the provisions of the present law. The amendment was rejected. The House later passed the bill, and while under consideration in the Senate Senator Reed of Pennsylvania moved the amendment which inserted the present national-origins clause into the bill. Upon its return to the House it was sent to conference, and the House conferees recommended the adoption of the amendment, which action was taken. Whether or not it is correct, I am informed this amendment was reluctantly accepted by the House in order that the whole bill might not fall of passage.

As I have said before, this is to my mind one of the most important questions that

confront us today, particularly in view of the fact that we have only a few weeks left in this session of Congress, and during which period it is essential that some affirmative action be taken in order to prevent the operation of this particular clause. To prevent its operation affirmative action must be taken by Congress. There are two ways in which we can take affirmative action, and when I say we, of course I refer to both branches of Congress. One is by joint resolution deferring its operation and the other is by enacting necessary legislation to repeal its provisions. The other procedure that we may employ is the passive, inactive negative, doing nothing method, as a result of which, in accordance with the ruling given by the Attorney General, as I understand it, the President of the United States is compelled on or before April 1 of this year to proclaim the provisions of this clause to be in operation. This means that the quotas established thereunder by the President's Commission will become operative July 1, 1929.

The President's commission to which I refer was made up of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Commerce (now President-elect Hoover), and they in turn each appointed two members of their respective departments as a joint committee to make a more thorough investigation of the matter.

I realize that men have different opinions and different views on this question. I appreciate the fact they have the right to entertain their views if they are honestly arrived at, and naturally every Member of this House arrives at honest views, so far as my opinion is concerned. I do not use the above language with the intent that you might infer that I have any feeling to the contrary, because you, like myself, are actuated by a desire to render that degree of public service in this body which you feel the best interests of the country demand and which is in accordance with your conscience. [Applause.]

I also considered it my duty to vote as my conscience dictated on any matters which came before any legislative body of which I was a member, and the question of party affiliation never influenced me unless a party principle or responsibility was involved. In that case I followed, and will follow, the principles enunciated by the Democratic Party, because the incorporation of them into law will be for the best interests of the people.

It is my belief that a public servant should represent all elements and political creeds in his district. So, in approaching this question, let me say that I recognize that men in both political parties differ and differ honestly.

I am going to try to impress upon you the fact that the basis of the determination, as provided in the national-origins clause, so-called, is almost impossible of ascertainment. It is left to the field of conjecture.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Is it not a fact you have to go back 300 years to determine the statistics as to national origin?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. And is it not a fact we have not the statistics available?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. That is in part correct. The basis prescribed by this clause for the establishing of quotas of countries affected has as its object a definite purpose which is unfair and discriminatory, and a reflection upon elements of past immigrants, now Americans, some for many generations, that have contributed so much toward the building up and progress of our country. The basis for computation is also uncertain and leaves the calculation, whichever it may be, to the field of conjecture. The clause provided a method of calculation which is incapable of ascertainment without resort to guesswork. Any such basis is bound to result in quotas which will be discriminatory,

if not insulting, in their character. A careful examination of testimony presented to different committees, also books written by some of the proponents, and addresses made on different occasions by some of them justify the assertion that the underlying motive is un-American.

If we are going to establish an immigration policy, let it be definite. Let it be certain. The expression of the principle should be definite and certain, whether it be a closed immigration policy, a restrictive immigration policy, or a partially restrictive policy as set forth in the 1925 act.

Let it be definite and certain, but not left to uncertainty; and let both branches of Congress determine with certainty not only the expression of the principle we believe in, but with certainty as to the quotas the different quota countries shall be entitled to. Not only does Congress, by permitting the national-origins clause to go into operation, evade the duty of making the quotas themselves, but it passes the responsibility to the President's commission, composed of three Secretaries, and they in turn pass it on to Doctor Hill and his associates.

I might say at this time that I intend to follow the suggestion made by Governor Smith in his statement after the last election, in which he urged the Democratic Members of Congress to support President-elect Hoover during his term of office on all legislation that relates to the general welfare and progress of the people.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. I hope at some not distant time the gentleman will inform the House what the fundamental principles of the Democratic Party are.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think those fundamental principles are so well known that the average man knows them, but I shall be glad to enlighten the gentleman out in the lobby some time.

The first indication of the unreliability and uncertainty of the basis of determination as provided in the national-origins clause was the postponement of its operation until July 1, 1927, in order that the quotas might be established. In order to regulate immigration up to the going into effect of the national-origins clause it was provided in the 1924 act "that the annual quota of any nationality shall be 2 percent of the number of foreign-born individuals of such nationality resident in continental United States as determined by the United States census of 1890, but the minimum quota of any nationality shall be 100."

This, like the national-origins clause, only governed quota countries. The practical operation of the present law meant that 164,000 immigrants constituted 2 percent of our foreignborn population as of 1890, and were allotted among the several European countries in accordance with the terms of this provision. Whether one believes in the policy of restrictive immigration or not, there is no question but what the original provision is at least definite and certain in its theory and operation. While the national-origins clause is certain as to the number of immigrants admissible each year from Europe, which is 153,000, every other provision thereof is unreliable, uncertain, and therefore inequitable.

This would be particularly so in its operation, if it ever goes into effect. I want to call to the attention of the Members that in accordance with the provisions of the national-origins clause the Secretaries of State, Commerce, and Labor, as a joint board, each appointed two representatives to try and perform the impossible task therein provided. It is fair to infer from all correspondence made by them that they approached this task with the realization of its difficulty of approximate ascertainment, and the fact that, in the main, they would have to rely

August 24, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

20783

upon conjecture. The results have clearly shown that to be the fact. Their work has been tirelessly and unselfishly rendered and yet their reports and findings are the strongest evidence of the human impossibility of performing such a task. In their report on December 16, 1926, will be found the following:

"We have found our task by no means simple, but we are carrying it out by methods which we believe to be statistically correct, utilizing the data that are available in accordance with what seems to us to be the intent and meaning of the law. We have not completed our work, but the figures which we are submitting for your information, though provisional and subject to revision, indicate approximately what the final results will be."

What stronger evidence of uncertainty?

Accompanying this report were the quotas which they had determined in accordance with the law, and which, while not complete and subject to revision, indicate approximately what the final results will be. These are not my words, but the words of Doctor Hill and his associates.

Thereafter, the operation of the law was deferred until July 1, 1928, and on February 27, 1928, other quotas were recommended by Doctor Hill and his associates. Having in mind the statement above quoted from report of 1927, that the 1927 quotas "indicated approximately what the final results will be," a comparison of these two quotas is very interesting and convincing as showing further the grave uncertainty of the basis of determination.

As a further indication of the uncertainty that existed in the minds of the President's commission, I quote a letter to the President under date of January 3, 1927:

JANUARY 3, 1927.

The President,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Pursuant to the provisions of sections 11 and 12 of the immigration act of 1924, we have the honor to transmit herewith the report of the subcommittee appointed by us for the purpose of determining the quota of each nationality in accordance with the provisions of said sections.

The report of the subcommittee is self-explanatory, and, while it is stated to be a preliminary report, yet it is believed that further investigation will not substantially alter the conclusions arrived at.

Although this is the best information we have been able to secure, we wish to call attention to the reservations made by the committee and to state that in our opinion the statistical and historical information available raises grave doubts as to the whole value of these computations as a basis for the purposes intended. We therefore can not assume responsibility for such conclusions under these circumstances.

Yours faithfully,

FRANK B. KELLOGG,
Secretary of State,
Department of State.
HERBERT HOOVER,
Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce.
JAMES J. DAVIS,
Secretary of Labor,
Department of Labor.

Furthermore, on February 25, 1928, the President's commission in transmitting the 1928 quotas above referred to said:

"We wish it clear that neither we individually nor collectively are expressing any opinion on the merits or demerits of this system of arriving at the quotas. We are simply transmitting the calculations made by the departmental committee in accordance with the act."

An analysis of the report of Doctor Hill and his associates, dated December 16, 1926, showing the manner upon which calculations were determined is further evidence of the impossibility of a fair determination, particularly in determining what portion of our white population of 1920 is derived from the "old native stock" of 1790. The records of immigration giving the number of immigrants arriving annually from each foreign country from 1820 to 1920 was in part relied upon. It is a well-known fact that a good portion of those who came from southern Ireland, Scotland, Wales, and Ulster came on vessels that started from an English port and were listed as emigrating from England. This was particularly true prior to 1870. In the case of Scotland, Wales, and Ulster it makes no difference, because their quotas under this law will be combined into one, but this situation seriously affects the quota that southern Ireland would be entitled to. Such a situation is further evidence of the grave uncertainty of a determination that will not be discriminatory.

The above immigration quotas were printed for the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, and column No. 1 is the report for 1928, column 2 the report for 1927, both made by Doctor Hill and his associates, and column 3 is the quotas under the present law.

Columns 1 and 2 relate to the national origins clause and the marked difference between them in the short period of one year seems to me to be inescapable evidence of the uncertainty of ascertainment.

A comparison will show that under the quotas that will be established if the national origins clause goes into effect that Germany will be reduced from 51,227 to 24,908; Irish Free State from 28,567 to 17,427; Norway from 6,453 to 2,403; Sweden from 9,561 to 3,399; Switzerland from 2,081 to 1,614; Denmark from 2,789 to 1,234; France from 3,954 to 3,308; while Great Britain and northern Ireland will be increased from 34,007 to 65,894; Austria from 785 to 1,639; Belgium from 512 to 1,328; Hungary from 473 to 1,181; Italy from 3,845 to 5,989; Netherlands from 1,648 to 3,083; Russia from 2,248 to 3,540. These are the most important changes that will occur. As I have said before the strongest evidence of uncertainty is the difference between the report of 1927 and 1928.

Another year has gone by since the last computation was submitted and which will be the quotas if the national origins clause goes into effect. It is fair to assume that if a report had been made this year by Doctor Hill and his associates that further changes would have been noted.

In passing, I want it clearly understood that I have the greatest of admiration for Doctor Hill and his associates. They are performing what must be to them an unpleasant task, because of its impossibility of performance. They have performed their work unselfishly and tirelessly. They are simply trying to carry out the law. It is clear from their reports, so far as I am concerned, that they realize that the records are so lacking that they had to rely upon conjecture.

It is significant that the only census taken in the United States prior to 1850 was that of 1790. In the 1790 census only the heads of families were reported, and there was no indication of the land of their nativity or of their ancestors.

Doctor Hill and his associates deemed that they would have to depend in the main upon the sounding of names to determine nativity, and he frankly admitted in the House hearings held in 1927 that names may indicate origin from any one of two or more countries. He further said that in the event of the names having an origin from England or Scotland or Ireland the probabilities were that because of the predominance of the English of foreign birth and descent at that time the census takers designated them as being of English descent.

The census of 1790 showed the white population of the then 17 States was 3,172,444. The following figures show in detail the population of the several States, with an estimate of the strength of the various nationals therein, which, so far as I can ascertain, is based upon guesswork:

Country or area	1 National origin quotas submitted Feb. 27, 1928	2 National origin quotas submitted Jan. 7, 1927	3 Present quotas, based on 1890 for- eign-born popula- tion
Armenia.....	100		124
Australia, including Papua, etc.....	100	100	121
Austria.....	1,639	1,486	185
Belgium.....	1,328	410	512
Czechoslovakia.....	2,726	2,248	3,073
Danzig, Free City of.....	137	122	228
Denmark.....	1,234	1,044	2,789
Estonia.....	100	100	124
Finland.....	568	559	471
France.....	3,954	3,837	3,954
Germany.....	24,908	28,428	51,227
Great Britain, North- ern Ireland.....	65,894	73,039	34,007
Greece.....	312	367	100
Hungary.....	1,181	967	473
Irish Free State.....	17,427	13,862	28,567
Italy, including Rhodes, etc.....	5,989	6,091	3,845
Latvia.....	243	184	142
Lithuania.....	492	494	344
Netherlands.....	3,083	2,421	1,648
Norway.....	2,403	2,267	6,453
Poland.....	6,090	4,978	5,982
Portugal.....	457	290	503
Rumania.....	311	516	603
Russia, European and Asiatic.....	3,540	4,781	2,248
Spain.....	305	674	131
Sweden.....	3,399	3,259	9,561
Switzerland.....	1,614	1,198	2,081
Syria and the Lebanon (French).....	125	100	100
Turkey.....	233	233	100
Yugoslavia.....	739	777	671
Total.....	153,685	153,541	164,647

1 Including 37 minimum quotas of 100 each.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 24, 1965

White population in 1790 as classified by nationality in chapter IX of "A Century of Population Growth", published by the Bureau of the Census in 1909

Nationality as indicated by name	United States		Maine		New Hampshire		Vermont		Massachusetts		Rhode Island	
	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent
All nationalities.....	3,172,444	100.0	96,107	100.0	141,112	100.0	85,072	100.0	373,187	100.0	64,670	100.0
English.....	2,605,699	82.1	89,515	93.1	132,723	94.1	81,149	95.4	354,528	95.0	62,079	96.0
Scotch.....	221,582	7.0	4,154	4.3	6,643	4.7	2,592	3.0	13,435	3.6	1,976	3.1
Irish.....	61,534	1.9	1,334	1.4	1,346	1.0	697	.7	3,732	1.0	459	.7
Dutch.....	78,959	2.5	279	.3	153	.1	428	.5	373	.1	19	(¹)
French.....	17,619	.6	115	.1	142	.1	183	.3	746	.2	88	.1
German.....	176,407	5.6	436	.5	—	—	35	(¹)	75	(¹)	33	(¹)
Hebrew.....	1,243	(¹)	44	(¹)	—	—	—	—	67	(¹)	9	(¹)
All other.....	9,421	.3	230	.2	97	.1	148	.2	231	.1	7	(¹)

Nationality as indicated by name	Connecticut		New York		New Jersey		Pennsylvania		Delaware		Maryland	
	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent
All nationalities.....	232,236	100.0	314,366	100.0	169,014	100.0	423,373	100.0	46,310	100.0	208,649	100.0
English.....	223,437	96.2	245,901	78.2	98,650	58.0	249,656	59.0	39,966	86.3	175,265	84.0
Scotch.....	6,425	2.8	10,034	3.2	13,116	7.7	49,667	11.7	3,473	7.5	13,562	6.5
Irish.....	1,589	.7	2,525	.8	12,049	7.1	8,614	2.0	1,806	3.9	5,005	2.4
Dutch.....	253	.1	50,600	16.1	21,581	12.7	2,623	.6	463	1.0	209	.1
French.....	512	.2	2,424	.8	3,565	2.1	2,341	.6	232	.5	1,460	.7
German.....	4	(¹)	1,103	.4	15,673	9.2	110,357	26.1	185	.4	12,310	5.9
Hebrew.....	6	(¹)	385	.1	(¹)	—	21	(¹)	(¹)	—	626	.3
All other.....	6	(¹)	1,394	.4	5,265	3.1	194	(¹)	185	.4	209	.1

Nationality as indicated by name	Virginia		North Carolina		South Carolina		Georgia		Kentucky		Tennessee	
	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent
All nationalities.....	442,117	100.0	288,181	100.0	140,173	100.0	52,886	100.0	61,133	100.0	31,913	100.0
English.....	378,799	85.0	240,309	83.1	115,480	82.4	43,948	83.1	50,802	83.1	26,519	83.1
Scotch.....	31,391	7.1	32,388	11.2	16,447	11.7	6,847	12.2	6,847	11.2	3,574	11.2
Irish.....	8,842	2.0	6,651	2.3	3,576	2.6	1,216	2.3	1,406	2.3	784	2.3
Dutch.....	884	.2	578	.2	29	.0	106	.2	122	.2	64	.2
French.....	2,653	.6	868	.3	1,832	1.3	159	.3	153	.3	96	.3
German.....	21,664	4.9	8,097	2.8	2,313	1.7	1,481	2.8	1,712	2.8	894	2.8
Hebrew.....	—	—	1	(¹)	86	.1	(¹)	—	(¹)	—	(¹)	—
All other.....	884	.2	289	.1	146	.1	53	.1	61	.1	32	.1

¹ Less than one-tenth of 1 per cent.

* Included in "All other."

As one indication of the uncertainty of relying on the 1790 census I may mention that it does not take into consideration the size of the families and that some nationalities are quite prone to more productivity than others.

In determining the quotas under the national origins clause the white population of 1920, numbering about 94,000,000, were divided into two groups, one called "old native stock" and the other "immigrant stock." The census of 1790 was taken as the basis for determining what portion of our population in 1920 were descended from the population of 1790. It was determined that 41,000,000 persons in the United States in 1920 were descendants of the "old native stock." Bearing the fact in mind that all persons who arrived here since 1790, or their descendants, are described as "immigrant stock," and looking through the roll of the Members of Congress it is apparent to me that 80 percent of our membership fall within that class.

When you consider that the first decennial census taken in the United States, outside of the one in 1790, was in 1850; that there are no official records prior to 1790, together with the loss, in the Ellis Island fire in 1896, of records of immigrations that flowed through the great city of New York from 1820 on; the destruction of many historical records by the British, when they occupied the city of Washington in the War of 1812, together with many other matters of consideration, we can then realize the impossibility of establishing quotas which will not be discriminatory to some of our nationals.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Is it not a fact that Doctor Hill testified before the Committee on Immigration that he could only go back about 100 years?

Mr. McCORMACK. My impression is that Doctor Hill testified that the United States

decennial censuses could only go back to 1850; that the records of the ports of entry go back only to about 1820; that is, the immigrants coming into different ports of entry, as distinguished from the facts revealed in the decennial censuses. My observation and study further show that thousands and thousands of immigrants coming from Germany, from Ireland, from Scotland, and from other places were compelled to come over on ships owned by English interests and they were listed as English citizens.

That is not submitted as criticism, but as a piece of evidence. Everything based on conjecture is bound to be discriminatory and offensive to some of our nationals. We are not an English, or an Irish, or a German, or a French nation. We do not want any element to predominate. We are an American Nation. We may have a great feeling of fondness and regard for the land of our forebears, as we should, but above every other consideration we are Americans. The history of the recent war has evidenced the fact that Americanism means the same thing to all of our citizens, irrespective of their national origin—that is, love of flag, country, and that upon which everything that we possess governmentally stands, the Constitution of the United States.

We want Americans. We want the immigrants who come over here—the same as my forebears did two generations ago—to be filled with a love of our institutions. To a certain extent, undoubtedly, they will come here seeking material gain, but in the main they look up to this Government of ours as a land of opportunity. I recognize that conditions might change our immigration policy. That necessity might arise some day when we might consider the advisability of a change, but if we are going to have a change, let it be definite and certain, not only in principle but definite and certain in practice.

Now, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the fact that this uncertainty exists is further evidenced by the report

made by the President's commission, comprised, as I said before, of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Commerce—the then Secretary of Commerce, President-elect Hoover. Not only that, but President-elect Hoover in his acceptance speech said he favored the repeal of the national-origins clause. He recognized the impossibility of human determination in accordance with the basis provided in that law. He recognized the offensiveness of it, and he recognized that this was not bringing into effect in America a new policy with reference to the restriction of immigration, because we have it now. We have it now in the act of 1924. Two percent of the foreign-born population as of 1890 means approximately 164,000 immigrants who are entitled to admission from quota countries in Europe each year, and in turn the number to which each country is entitled is simply a matter of mathematics. That can be arrived at. It is a definite and certain enunciation of a principle, and it naturally follows that there is a definite and certain determination of the quotas.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Can the gentleman tell the House how this national origins was determined, based upon what figures, what the present quota is as based on the act of 1924, and what would be the quota of all nationals under the national-origins clause? Has the gentleman those figures?

Mr. McCORMACK. As I understand it, the present law permits one hundred and sixty-four thousand and a few odd hundred to come in each year, while the national-origins clause authorizes one hundred and fifty-three and some few hundreds to come in each year. Am I correct?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. While the national-origins clause provides a maximum of 150,000, it also provides in addition that certain countries which had no quota before or whose computation would be less than 100,

August 24, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

20785

are entitled to the admission of a minimum of 100, and that is the reason why it comes to approximately 153,000.

Mr. ROSSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. ROSSION of Kentucky. As I understand it, the gentleman is opposed to the national-origins provision of the present law?

Mr. McCORMACK. Precisely.

Mr. ROSSION of Kentucky. Does the gentleman favor the quota based on the 1890 census? The present law is based on the 1890 census, as I understand.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; and that is definite and certain.

Mr. ROSSION of Kentucky. Does the gentleman favor the 1890 census as a basis, or some other census—the 1910 census or the 1920 census?

Mr. McCORMACK. To be frank with the gentleman, his question goes into something that I did not intend to discuss, and I am equally frank in saying that I am rapidly approaching a mental state where I realize that through necessity we must close this open door and bring about some kind of a restriction. Whether that should be based on the 1910 census or the 1890 census is just a question of policy, based upon the necessity. I can see where conditions might change; where in the years to come through depletion in our population, because of some great catastrophe, for example—and population increases either by a greater number of births than deaths or by an increase in immigration over emigration; that is the only means through which an increase in population takes place—and I can see where a principle applicable to one period might of necessity be changed when applied to conditions in a different period.

Mr. ROSSION of Kentucky. We are legislating for this period.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no objection to the present quota, based on the 1890 census.

Mr. GARBER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. GARBER. The proposed change would greatly facilitate the administration of the law, would it not?

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman refer to the national-origins clause?

Mr. GARBER. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not think so.

Mr. GARBER. I mean that the proposed change to a definite basis would greatly facilitate the administration of the law.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman means the law as it exists at present?

Mr. GARBER. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with the gentleman. Now, bearing on that, may I call the attention to a statement made by the Commissioner General of Immigration in his annual report for 1925, page 29:

"The bureau feels that the present method of ascertaining the quotas is far more satisfactory than the proposed determination by national origin; that it has the advantages of simplicity and certainty. It is of the opinion that the proposed change will lead to great confusion and result in complexities, and accordingly it is recommended that the pertinent portions of section 11, providing for this revision of the quotas as they now stand, be rescinded."

I am now coming back to 1790. One interesting phase of the evidence about the 1790 census, where it showed a little over 3,000,000 in the 17 States, was in the State of Pennsylvania, as indicating the uncertainty of the 41,000,000 being even approximately a fair estimate of the descendants of the inhabitants as shown in that census.

I do not want to depend upon memory, so let me quote verbatim from the extract which I have here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield this gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. In an article written in 1789, as to the immigration into Pennsylvania in the period around 1749, it was said by the writer that—

"In the summer of the year 1749, 25 sail of large vessels arrived with German passengers alone, which brought about 12,000 souls, some of the ships about 600 each; and in several other years near the same number of these people arrived annually."

This is for only a limited period around 1746, and it is fair to assume that some came before and some came afterwards, and yet according to the 1790 census there were only 110,000 Germans in the State of Pennsylvania.

But let us go a step further: "And in some years nearly as many annually from Ireland."

Yet in 1790 there was only an estimated population of 8,000 in the State of Pennsylvania of either Irish birth or Irish descent.

This is some evidence indicating the uncertainty we have in the records prior to 1790. We have absolutely none from 1790 to 1820, and from 1820 our records of ports of entry are entirely unreliable, first, because of giving their birth in the wrong country, in some cases because of necessity; and, second, because the records in the city of New York were destroyed in the Ellis Island fire in 1896. Furthermore, many historical records of the colonial days were destroyed when the British occupied the city of Washington during the War of 1812.

All of these things have brought about an air of uncertainty so that the basis for the determination of national origins is inadvisable, unwise, inequitable, bound to be discriminatory because in the main it is left to the field of conjecture.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Under the present quota law Ireland receives a quota of 28,000, but under the national origins law, if it takes effect, Ireland only gets 8,000, thereby losing 20,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think there have been two corrections made since that estimate.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Is there anything the gentleman can find from his investigation to show how they base that loss, upon what percentage and how far they have gone back?

Mr. McCORMACK. That basis of 8,330 was an estimate given by Captain Trevor, who, I understand, is the parent of this idea, although the Ku Klux Klan claims the credit for it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The parent of this piece of legislation is Mr. Reed. The House never passed it at all.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; in the Senate it was an amendment offered by Senator REED of Pennsylvania, and right there let me say that if this law goes into effect it is those of German birth and descent and those of Irish birth and descent in Pennsylvania that in the main can take the blame.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. May I ask the gentleman another question? Senator REED takes the credit for it, but he borrowed it from Senator Lodge. Does the gentleman know that?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; this Captain Trevor consulted Senator Lodge first, who took him to Senator REED.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. You will find the date given in the hearing as March 6, 1924.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is just one more reference I might make. During the past few days a representative of the American Legion unfortunately made a reference with which I am not in accord. I am sorry he made this reference, because I am a member of the Legion and the two other members of my family, two younger brothers, who constitute the whole family, are also members of this Legion. This representative made a statement which is offensive to all of our citizens, and I hope sincerely that the Legion

members throughout the country who might be offended by it will not go to the unwise direction of resigning their membership.

The American Legion is a great body. It is a much-needed body, the same as the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which is another one of our great veterans' organizations as well as all of the minor organizations which have as their foundation purposes consistent with the progress of our country in establishing traditions which the future generations will be proud of; but in this particular respect, by stating that the Legion is in favor of the national-origins provision, they have taken a position which, if a referendum were submitted to the members of the Legion, would undoubtedly amaze the Members of Congress as to the vote to the contrary in the Legion.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. May I say to my colleague that I have just received three telegrams from three Legion posts in Lawrence, Peabody, and Lynn, Mass., saying that the sentiments which the representatives of the Legion gave before the committee are not in accord with the sentiment of the membership of those posts?

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman for his observation. May I say at this time that Mr. CONNERY recently displayed the finest act of courage that I have ever seen on the part of any legislator when he voted for the reapportionment bill. I hope that his constituents appreciate his type of representation.

May I add, the danger of this, Mr. Chairman, is that we are going back 300 years and making you and me, who are Americans, and consider ourselves Americans, take a position which would destroy the assimilation which all elements and all races have undergone during the past 300 years, and making not only the foreign born of 1920 take a position on this but every one of us, no matter what the origin of our common ancestors who first came to America may have been?

But going back to the American Legion, it has taken a position on quotas. When they take a position favoring the underlying principle of the national-origins clause, they take a position upon the quotas, and when they do that they make a mistake and they exceed the purposes of their organization.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will.

Mr. SCHAFER. Has the American Legion in convention assembled gone on record in favor of the national-origins scheme for determining the immigration quotas?

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand they have, yes; but it was very peculiarly worded:

"Therefore be it resolved by the American Legion in convention assembled, That we favor and recommend continuance of the method of restriction upon immigration—"

That is a primary part, and they may have the right to do that. They could go on record in favor of closed or open or restricted immigration. I do not dispute their authority to do that; but then the resolution continues:

"That we favor and recommend continuance of the method of restriction upon immigration in the 1924 immigration law with its fundamental national-origins provision, so that American citizenship and economic prosperity may be maintained at the highest possible level."

And in a statement to the Senate Committee on Immigration they said:

"We emphatically uphold the theory underlying the national-origins provision, which is that immigration quotas based upon entire population of the Nation is not only

20786

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 24, 1965

the fairest method for selecting immigrants, but is the most certain method"—

Mark this language—"the most certain method of maintaining in the future the blend of population and the racial mixtures as they exist in America today."

In convention assembled they went on record in favor of that because it was the best means "by which prosperity may be maintained at the present time," the resolution read.

It must be borne distinctly in mind that the quotas cannot be disassociated from the principle itself. The going into effect of the clause automatically established the quotas, and when the Legion takes a position on the principle they take a position on the quotas established thereunder.

What those quotas will be are a matter of record. Furthermore, the representative said that it was a question between patriotism and slackerism. I also deny such a question is involved. In support of this argument he cited the number of aliens that claimed exemption in the late war. In the first place, the figures do not present the facts correctly. In the second place, the only inferences to draw therefrom is that the nationals of those countries which will receive a reduced quota by the operation of the national origins were the slackers in the late war. This is not only vicious and unwarranted but false. Such an argument is an attack not only on those foreign born who were here in 1917-18 but upon all generations of Americans of the same blood or descent. Let us see who they are that will suffer by the operation of the national-origins clause and then we can see what elements of our citizenry were insidiously offended and insulted by this argument.

The French, Swiss, Swedish, Norwegians, Danish, Irish, and Germans. All elements representing our best blood, the equal of any other and second to none. In every great crisis their descendants have proven their love for our flag and our institutions of government as set forth in the Constitution. In the Revolutionary War their representation was outstanding, particularly the Irish and the Germans, and the French Government showed its friendship in a way that occupies one of the foremost pages in our history. Are they slackers? Some may think so, but history records otherwise. During the Civil War alone the Irish and the Germans in the service outnumbered the whole army of the South, and each element, as we are compelled to refer to them under this law, had more men in service than any other element of our citizenry. And, yes; after the war was over, and when the men of the South had laid down their arms, and after the death of the great President, which was an unfortunate event for the South at that time, an unthinking North imposed conditions upon the South that were unbearable and inhuman. In the dark days of the carpet-bagging period of the days of reconstruction following the war the only voice raised in Congress for the South were the Representatives in Congress from the city of New York, all of Irish descent, and Charles Francis Adams, of Massachusetts. It was their voices that finally brought about some degree of reason.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER. Then the American Legion did not go on record in favor of the national-origins clause?

Mr. McCORMACK. All I know is what it says in this statement, and from that I draw certain inferences. The gentleman's inferences are as good as mine. I am going to rely on my inference and I do not think the gentleman and I will have any dispute. May I further say to the gentleman that the great

agricultural districts of the country have been brought to their present high level by that class of immigrants which the national-origins scheme will discriminate against, and I hope it will be brought to a higher state by the enactment of legislation which will be carrying out the platforms of both parties.

Mr. SCHAFER. I will state that the people of the great State of Wisconsin are absolutely opposed to the national-origins clause, and so are the members of the American Legion in my State. I am not talking about the few officers who may claim to speak for the Legion. The national-origins clause should be repealed. The gentleman is making a fine argument for its repeal.

Mr. McCORMACK. Some argument has been advanced on the question of certain nationals failing to assimilate. What is the best test of assimilation? To me it is what percentage of immigrants from different countries indicate their permanence and love for America by becoming a citizen. The records of the census of 1920 are interesting in this respect. I will simply read it and allow you to draw your own conclusions:

"The census of 1920 shows that the foreign born from England proper, who were here when that census was taken and who were naturalized, is 64.8; Scotland, 65.6; Wales, 73.5; Ireland, 72.3; Norway, 67.3; Sweden, 69.5; Denmark, 69.6; Netherlands, which has a marked gain, 58.1; Belgium, which has a gain, 55.3; Switzerland, 64.9; France, 60.1; Germany, 73.3; Canada, French, 47.0; Canada, others, 58; and other countries, ranging from 44.7 down to 8.9, every one of the latter of which, under national origins, will gain, with the exception of Rumania."

The argument has also been advanced by certain people that America must maintain a British ascendancy in order that our institutions of Government might be preserved. They say that the operation of the national-origins clause will bring that situation about. Since when has the United States had to depend upon any other country for its existence? The last time that history records that we were a dependency of England was prior to 1776. Yorktown, with its victory, brought about the consummation of our independence. In that conflict for independence, 10,000 men of Irish blood served from Massachusetts alone. Those of German descent, particularly from Pennsylvania, showed their love for the cause of freedom. Likewise, those of Swiss, Swedish, French, Scotch, and other nationalities, rendered yeoman service. No one excelled the other. They fought inspired.

We can not deny, and would not want to deny it, that those of English blood and extraction have contributed in every way in the settling of the Colonies, in the War for Independence, and in building up our country and protecting it in time of danger, but we should not discriminate against others who have likewise done their duty.

The operation of the national-origins clause is an affirmative statement by the Congress of the United States that the continuity of our Government is dependent upon England. Such a declaration of subservience should be abhorrent to all who consider themselves Americans.

Mr. Chairman, both parties through their standard bearers in the recent campaign went on record as favoring the repeal of the national-origins clause. Between now and March 4 action will have to be taken in order to prevent its operation. While both parties have responsibilities, the party in the majority will be directly responsible for this iniquitous, discriminatory law unless proper action is taken to repeal or defer its operation. [Applause from both sides of the aisle.]

I have received the following telegrams from American Legion posts:

SOUTH BOSTON, MAEE., February 14, 1929.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Post opposed to statement of Legion representatives. Do not know of any slackers in this district of nationals mentioned. District predominantly Irish. Exceeded quota in every instance. * * *

COLUMBIA POST, No. 51, AMERICAN LEGION,
SOUTH BOSTON, MASS.
JAMES F. VAUGHN, Commander.

BOSTON, MASS., February 11, 1929.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Congressman,
Washington, D.C.:

Michael J. Perkins Post, American Legion, resents any individual attempting to represent the thought of the American Legion when he says that our neighbors in Europe, whether they be Scandinavian, Jews, English, Greek, Polish, or Irish, are alien slackers. Fortunately our allies and ourselves united as one people * * *

JOHN J. LYNDON, Commander.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 2580, with Mr. ROONEY of New York in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the members of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, who produced H.R. 2580, as amended.

This amended bill was made possible by the diligence, the thoroughness, the faithful appearance at hearings, and the active role played by all the members of the subcommittee during the public hearings and in the 18 executive sessions required.

I wish to thank all members of the full committee.

The immigration bill now before the House is a clean bill, in all respects a bipartisan product of the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality.

This is an historic bill, with bold and deliberate purpose to forge the way toward a selective immigration system with qualitative and quantitative controls.

August 24, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

20787

Such a system conforms with our needs at this stage of our national development, and is long overdue.

This bill in no way avoids or weakens the constitutional responsibility laid upon the Congress to regulate immigration into the United States.

It reaffirms that constitutional responsibility through a clear-cut, self-executing law which delegates no authority to the executive branch which properly and historically rests with the Congress.

This bill rejects all proposals which would have blurred the constitutional lines separating the legislative and executive powers and vigorously rejects the proposed delegation of congressional authority to the executive for establishing policy to govern the admission of immigrants into the United States.

Our subcommittee conducted 39 public hearings on proposed revisions of the immigration law which opened on June 11, 1964, and closed on June 1, this year.

During that time 94 Members of Congress appeared before the subcommittee or submitted individual views for consideration by the subcommittee.

The Secretary of State, two Attorneys General, the Secretary of Labor, and other representatives of the administration appeared to testify in public or executive hearings.

That testimony was followed by witnesses representing nongovernmental organizations, and by individual citizens, with an interest in this public issue.

I will include at the conclusion of my remarks a listing of the witnesses appearing before our subcommittee.

A review of that listing will reveal that every shade of official and public opinion on the subject of proposed immigration reform—pro and con—has been heard and evaluated.

Following the public hearings, our subcommittee met in 18 executive sessions to produce the immigration bill now before the House.

In our deliberations the interests of the United States were at all times first and foremost, and those interests are reflected clearly in the bill.

There were wide differences among the members of our subcommittee on key issues, but those differences have been reconciled in the bill now before you.

The vote in our subcommittee of eight to zero, with one abstention, speaks clearly for the bipartisan character of the bill and speaks loudly for its merits.

The subcommittee bill was approved by the full judiciary committee—without one single change—by a vote of 27 to 4.

I welcome this opportunity to thank publicly and to commend our distinguished colleague from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] for the vigorous role he played in the exacting work of our subcommittee.

As the ranking minority member of our subcommittee his leadership was outstanding.

I am equally indebted to our distinguished colleague from Kentucky [Mr. CHURCH], the ranking majority member of our subcommittee, an 18-year veteran on the subcommittee, for his constructive contributions to our subcommittee bill.

The fundamental issue in the public hearings was the national origins quota system.

That is, whether that system should be repealed and be replaced by a new system of immigrant admissions.

That issue was resolved by the subcommittee in our first executive session.

There was unanimity on the need to repeal the national origins quota system and to replace it with a new system.

The basic reasons for our decision are threefold:

First. The national origins quota system does not regulate immigration into the United States—as many people have been misled into believing, and as proponents of the system believed it would.

Fifteen years ago, nonquota immigration had equaled quota immigration.

That was 25 years after the quota system was enacted into law.

During the past 15 years nonquota immigration increased to the point where it has now doubled quota immigration.

This trend will continue to accelerate unless Congress takes remedial action now.

Second. Our Secretary of State and two Attorneys General have testified that the quota system has made problems in the conduct of our relations with certain foreign countries because of overtones of discrimination and implied favoritism for the nationals of some countries as against the nationals of other countries.

In the opinion of these Cabinet officers this problem is aggravated by the fact some high quota countries do not use their allotted numbers while other countries with low quotas have long waiting lists of preference applicants, the majority of whom are relatives of U.S. citizens.

Third. While the United States has by far the most generous immigration system so far as numbers admitted each year, the system has not been working for the best interests of the United States—domestically or in terms of our international commitments.

Despite the fact we have been admitting close to 300,000 immigrants per year for the past 10 years, we are still confronted with the same kind of human problems which have caused Congress to enact 12 separate pieces of public legislation during the past 12 years.

I refer particularly to the long backlogs of relatives of U.S. citizens and permanent resident aliens in the oversubscribed countries.

The remaining 17 executive sessions of our subcommittee bill were taken up with reaching agreement on the basic principles which should govern a new system of immigrant admissions.

In this process we made a detailed examination of every possible method, its implications, and its estimated outcomes.

The new method proposed is, in my considered judgment, a long forward step in the direction of a selective immigration system with qualitative and quantitative controls.

Here are the basic elements of the proposed new system of immigrant admissions:

First. The national origins quota system is repealed, effective July 1, 1968.

Second. The Asia-Pacific triangle concept is repealed immediately.

This concept has met with strong reactions from our allies and friends in Asia who have come to regard it as the same kind of personal affront as the old Chinese Exclusion Act.

Moreover the proposed selective system of immigrant admissions included in the bill guarantees that no country can receive a disproportionate number of the total visas authorized.

Third. A numerical limit of 170,000 immigrant admissions per year is established, exclusive of the spouses, children, and parents of U.S. citizens, for all countries outside the Western Hemisphere.

Fourth. A numerical ceiling of 20,000 per year is fixed for any 1 country, exclusive of the spouses, children, and parents of U.S. citizens.

This ceiling will not apply to the present high quota countries, notably Great Britain and Germany, until July 1, 1968.

It will apply, however, to all present low quota countries during the 3-year waiting period and thereafter when it will apply to all countries outside the western hemisphere.

Fifth. During the 3-year waiting period, from date of enactment to July 1, 1968, the bill permits the use of authorized but unused quota numbers from the previous year.

We have, however, restricted the use of these visa numbers to preference class applicants in the oversubscribed countries.

Those are primarily the relatives of citizens and permanent resident aliens of the United States.

Sixth. A new system of preferences is established, with percentum limitations and priorities as among the new preference classes.

This is the heart, the governing criteria for the new selective system of immigration.

Family unity is made the first and foremost objective of the new system.

Spouses, children, and parents of U.S. citizens come first and there is no numerical limit placed on their admission.

The other preference classes follow in this order:

Twenty percent to unmarried children over 21 years of age of U.S. citizens.

Twenty percent to spouses and unmarried sons and daughters of permanent resident aliens.

Ten percent to persons who are members of the professions or who because of their exceptional ability in the sciences and the arts will substantially benefit the national economy, cultural interests or welfare of the United States.

Ten percent to married sons or married daughters of U.S. citizens.

Ten percent to persons who are capable of performing specified skilled or unskilled labor—not of a temporary or seasonal nature—for which there is a demonstrated shortage of employable and willing workers in the United States.

Six percent to refugees who are the victims of Communist or other totalitarian persecution, under procedures

August 24, 1965

wherein U.S. officials are in exclusive control from start to finish.

Such visa numbers as are left over after these preference classes are satisfied will go to nonpreference applicants, strictly in the chronological order in which they qualify.

Seventh. New labor controls are established to govern the admission of all immigrant worker classes. These new controls require the Secretary of Labor to make an affirmative finding on an individual case basis that, with respect to the job the immigrant worker is to fill in the locality to which he is destined, there is no able, willing, qualified and available American worker to fill that job.

The Secretary of Labor must also find that the admission of such immigrant workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers similarly employed in the United States.

These new labor controls are mandatory for all worker immigrant classes.

They do not apply to the relative preference classes and the limited number of refugees provided for in the bill.

The AFL-CIO recommended that meaningful labor controls be incorporated into any reform immigration legislation and the new controls provided for in this bill have the strong support of organized labor.

Eighth. The bill repeals the so-called fair share refugee act and returns the parole provision of the law to its original intent.

The original intent of section 212 of the law was to cover individual cases only and then only in emergent circumstances.

An example of the original intent of the parole provision was the Andrea Doria ship disaster off our shores, when the surviving victims had neither passports nor identity documents required for admission to the United States.

We had to give them haven, but of a temporary nature, until they could resume their journey to Europe.

It was never intended to cover immigrant groups as such, certainly not refugees, and it was intended that people thus paroled into the United States would depart to their normal residence or domicile outside the United States when the purpose of their temporary admission had been satisfied.

In returning the parole provision of the law to its original intent we have established a 6-percent preference class for refugees, amounting to 10,200 per year, and have removed from the refugees the stigma of parole to which there has been objection because of its usual connotation.

In doing so we have provided for their conditional entry, a method which assures that all the present security measures will continue in full force and effect.

Ninth. The bill removes the word "physical" as a qualifier on the term "persecution."

This action recognizes that some Communist regimes have resorted to more subtle forms of persecution which are no less oppressive than physical torture.

Tyranny over the mind and spirit of a person has been demonstrated as more

fearsome than the ancient methods of torture which characterized the Communist takeover of many countries of Central and East Europe.

This relief has application to persons who flee from or otherwise escape from the countries behind the Iron Curtain.

Tenth. With respect to immigration from the Independent Republics of the Western Hemisphere, which has never been subjected to numerical limitations, the bill makes the following changes:

First. Jamaica and Trinidad-Tobago are accorded the same status as all other Independent Republics of this hemisphere.

They were granted independence in 1961 and we found no reason to treat them differently than any other country with Independent status in our hemisphere.

Second. The new labor controls I have described will apply to all natives of the Independent Republics of the Western Hemisphere who seek admission to the United States as worker immigrants.

Spouses, children, and parents of U.S. citizens or of permanent resident aliens are the only exemptions from these new controls.

Third. Adjustment of status in the United States for natives of the Independent Republics of this hemisphere is prohibited.

This prohibition results from the deceptive practice of people entering the United States on a visitor's visa with the clear intent to remain permanently in the United States.

Evidence indicates the growth of this practice in recent years demands a clear remedy.

Fourthly. When immigration from the Independent republics of the Western Hemisphere exceeds by 10 percent or more the average of the past 5 years, the President is required to report to Congress, with such recommendations as he may have.

Eleventh. The bill establishes a new class of aliens who are mandatorily excluded from admission.

Those are persons classified under the medical term of "sexual deviation."

Under present law such persons were intended to be excluded under the term "psychopathic personality."

However, the courts have ruled that psychopathic personality is too vague a term to cover sexual deviates.

The bill removes all doubts on this score by a change in terms to include sexual deviation as a clearly defined excludable class.

The bill removes epilepsy as a mandatorily excludable class of aliens.

The office of the Surgeon General has recommended this change.

Epilepsy is not communicable and is controllable with modern medication.

Persons so afflicted, who are able to convince the public health service medical examiners that their condition is controllable and that they are unlikely to become a public charge could, if otherwise eligible, be admitted as immigrants.

The bill also eliminates the term "feeble-minded" and replaces it with the term "mentally retarded." The term

"feeble-minded" has no accepted medical or legal meaning.

The term "mentally retarded" does have accepted medical and legal meaning.

Our subcommittee gave careful consideration to the proposals which would have authorized waivers under certain conditions for excludable classes defined in sections 212(a) (1), (2), (3), and (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

It was our determination that present procedures of the subcommittee have proven adequate to take care of any hardship cases that might arise in any category of these mandatorily excludable classes.

No evidence was produced to the contrary.

Twelfth. The misleading and highly controversial terms "quota" and "non-quota" are removed from the law.

We have substituted the new terms "immigrant visa"—for aliens who are natives of countries outside the Western Hemisphere—"special immigrant visas"—for natives of the Western Hemisphere countries—"conditional entries" for refugees, and "immediate relatives" for spouses, children, and parents of U.S. citizens.

Thirteenth. A uniform procedure is provided for the filing of petitions with the Attorney General to establish eligibility of aliens for preference status, immediate relative status and special immigrant status.

The date of approval of such petitions by the Attorney General establishes the priority of all applicants within the preference classes.

Valid petitions on file with the various consular offices abroad, on the effective date of the act, will remain valid and will retain the original date of approval by the Attorney General.

Fourteenth. A new orphan section consolidates three sections in the present law to provide a clear-cut definition of an eligible orphan.

Fifteenth. The Secretary of State is provided authority to flush the deadwood out of the waiting lists in the oversubscribed countries.

This authority is provided so that we will have accurate and meaningful reports on waiting lists in the future.

We do not have such accurate reports now.

A brief explanation is in order to the reasons why complete repeal of the national origins quota system will not take effect until July 1, 1968.

The subcommittee was concerned that an orderly transition take place from the old system to the new system.

It was equally concerned that all countries be on an equal footing; to the extent possible, when the new system would take effect.

That is why the bill authorizes the use of unused quota numbers from the previous year to clean out the current preference waiting lists in the oversubscribed countries.

The subcommittee was also concerned that an abrupt change might place the present high quota countries at a great disadvantage because in many of those countries it has not been necessary to

August 24, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

20789

file preference petitions because the allotted quota was sufficient to satisfy all the applicants who desired to emigrate to the United States.

The 3 year waiting period provides ample notice to all present high quota countries that effective July 1, 1968, all such countries will be subjected to the ceiling of 20,000 per year and that preference classes will determine to a very large extent the issuance of immigrant visas among all countries outside the Western Hemisphere.

Other minor changes have been made in the existing law to conform with the basic changes I have outlined.

I am advised there are some serious misunderstandings about certain proposals for revision which have been proposed, which are not in the subcommittee bill but which some people continue to believe have not been rejected in the subcommittee bill.

I have made an effort in the past several weeks to clear up these misunderstandings but apparently doubts still remain.

For the RECORD, the following controversial proposals are not included in the bill as amended now before the House:

First. There is no immigration board provided for in the bill.

Accordingly there is no delegation of authority for the distribution of visa numbers among countries or classes of alien applicants, including refugees.

Second. There is no delegation of congressional authority for setting immigration policy to regulate immigration into the United States.

Section 401 of the Immigration and Nationality Act which established a joint committee to determine immigration policy remains in the law without change of its statutory duties.

Third. The Attorney General is not given authority to parole refugees into the United States.

The parole provision of the law is returned to its original intent.

Refugees will not be paroled into the United States under the pending bill.

Provision is made for the conditional entry of not to exceed 10,200 refugees per year, under a congressional definition, and a method in which U.S. officials are in control, from start to finish.

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees makes no determinations whatever as to who is or is not a refugee under the bill before us.

Fourth. There is no requirement in this bill, as amended, making it mandatory that all visas authorized be issued.

The present permissive authority to issue visas to qualified immigrants remains intact.

There is no provision in this bill, as amended, which allows the build up of a backlog of immigrant visas to be used in future years.

Fifth. There is no waiver authority in the amended bill for the mandatorily excludable classes of aliens described in section 212 of the present law.

H.R. 2580, as amended by the subcommittee bill, is a sound bill.

It corrects the inequities in the present system.

It establishes clearly defined provisions of law which are self-executing.

The dangers of bureaucratic manipulation of the law are reduced to an absolute minimum.

This bill is a clarion call to Congress to fulfill its responsibilities for regulating immigration into the United States.

I urge every Member to support H.R. 2580, as amended.

Under leave granted, I include list of witnesses:

LIST OF WITNESSES APPEARING BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY

TESTIMONY

Hon. EMANUEL OELLER, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York: Text of H.R. 7700.

Hon. EDWIN E. WILLIS, a Representative in Congress from the State of Louisiana: Text of H.R. 9045.

Hon. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, a Representative in Congress from the State of Michigan.

Hon. PAUL G. ROGERS, a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida.

Hon. PETER W. ROBINO, Jr., a Representative in Congress from the State of New Jersey.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER, a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida: Text of H.R. 5320 and H.R. 11603.

Hon. BYRON G. ROGERS, a Representative in Congress from the State of Colorado.

Hon. BYRON G. ROGERS, a Representative in Congress from the State of Colorado—(testimony resumed).

Hon. JOHN V. LINDSAY, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York: Text of H.R. 11446.

Hon. JACK WESTLAND, a Representative in Congress from the State of Washington: Text of H.R. 7669.

Hon. THOMAS P. GILL, a Representative in Congress from the State of Hawaii.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, a Representative in Congress from the State of Colorado: Statement submitted by Mr. Amata Kabua.

Hon. THOMAS P. GILL, a Representative in Congress from the State of Hawaii—(testimony resumed).

Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER, a Representative in Congress from the State of California: Text of H.R. 2896 and H.R. 10271.

Hon. B. F. FRISK, a Representative in Congress from the State of California: text of H.R. 8025.

Hon. LEONARD FARSTEIN, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York.

Hon. JOHN B. ANDERSON, a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois: Text of H.R. 7919.

Hon. HAROLD M. RYAN, a Representative in Congress from the State of Michigan.

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA, a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois.

Hon. JOHN M. MURPHY, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York.

Hon. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York.

Hon. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois: Text of H.R. 4159 and H.R. 4435.

Hon. EDWARD J. PATTEN, a Representative in Congress from the State of New Jersey.

Hon. SEYMOUR HALPERN, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York: Text of H.R. 1629.

Hon. OGDEN R. REID, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York: Text of H.R. 11837.

Hon. FRANK J. HORTON, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York: Text of H.R. 11436.

Hon. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, a Representative in Congress from the State of Hawaii: Text of H.R. 6159, H.R. 6831, H.R. 6833, H.R. 7810.

STATEMENTS

Hon. JOSEPH P. ADDABO, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York.

Hon. WILLIAM A. BARRETT, a Representative in Congress from the State of Pennsylvania.

Hon. ROBERT R. BARRY, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York.

Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND, a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts.

Hon. GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr., a Representative in Congress from the State of California.

Hon. JAMES C. CLEVELAND, a Representative in Congress from the State of New Hampshire.

Hon. SILVIO O. CONTE, a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts.

Hon. JAMES C. CORMAN, a Representative in Congress from the State of California.

Hon. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, a Representative in Congress from the State of New Jersey.

Hon. JAMES J. DELANEY, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York.

Hon. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York.

Hon. CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr., a Representative in Congress from the State of Michigan.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL, a Representative in Congress from the State of Michigan.

Hon. HAROLD D. DONOHUE, a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts.

Hon. DON EDWARDS, a Representative in Congress from the State of California.

Hon. PAUL A. FINO, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York.

Hon. O. C. FISHER, a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas.

Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY, a Representative in Congress from the State of Rhode Island.

Hon. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, a Representative in Congress from the State of New Jersey.

Hon. ROBERT N. GIALMO, a Representative in Congress from the State of Connecticut.

Hon. JACOB H. GILBERT, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York.

Hon. HENRY B. GONZALEZ, a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas.

Hon. EDNA F. KELLY, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York.

Hon. JOE M. KILGORE, a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas.

Hon. ROBERT L. LEGGETT, a Representative in Congress from the State of California.

Hon. ROLAND V. LIBONATI, a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois.

Hon. JOHN J. McFALL, a Representative in Congress from the State of California.

Hon. TORBERT H. MACDONALD, a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts.

Hon. JOSEPH G. MINISH, a Representative in Congress from the State of New Jersey.

Hon. JOHN S. MONAGAN, a Representative in Congress from the State of Connecticut.

Hon. F. BRADFORD MORSE, a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York.

Hon. WILLIAM T. MURPHY, a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois.

Hon. LUCIEN N. NEDZI, a Representative in Congress from the State of Michigan.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN, a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts.

Hon. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois.

Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York.

Hon. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT, a Representative in Congress from the State of California.

Hon. ARMISTEAD SELDEN, a Representative in Congress from the State of Alabama.

Hon. CARLTON R. SICKLES, a Representative in Congress from the State of Maryland.

Hon. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, a Representative in Congress from the State of Connecticut.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., a Representative in Congress from the State of New Jersey.

August 24, 1965

20790

Hon. HERMAN TOLL, a Representative in Congress from the State of Pennsylvania.

Hon. CHARLES A. VANIK, a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio.

Hon. JOHN W. WYDLER, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York.

Hon. Dean Rusk, Secretary of State.

Hon. ROBERT F. KENNEDY, Attorney General.

Hon. W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor.

Hon. Norbert A. Schlei, Assistant Attorney General.

Hon. Raymond F. Farrell, Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Mr. James L. Hennessy, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Mr. Abba P. Schwartz, Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs.

Mr. James J. Hines, legal adviser, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs.

Mr. Allen B. Moreland, Director, Visa Office.

August 5, 1964: American Legion: Dr. Daniel J. O'Connor and Mr. Clarence Olsen.

National Association of Evangelicals: Mr. Robert A. Cook; Order of AHEPA: Mr. Gregory Lagakos.

August 6, 1964: American Committee on Italian Migration: Hon. Juvenal Marchisio; Doorstep Savannah, Inc.: Mrs. Rosalind Frame; National Economic Council, Inc.: Mr. Mark M. Jones.

August 7, 1964: Nationalities Service Center of Cleveland: Mr. John Papandreas. AFL-CIO: Mr. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn; American Council for Nationalities Service: Miss Edith Lowenstein.

August 10, 1964: Industrial Union Division (AFL-CIO): Mr. James Carey; Daughters of the American Revolution: Mrs. Robert V. H. Duncan; National Jewish organizations listed in statement: Mr. Murray I. Gurfein and Mr. James P. Rice; Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States: Mr. Francis W. Stover; Lutheran Immigration Service: Mr. Donald E. Anderson.

August 11, 1964: Danube-Swabian Association of America, Inc.: Mr. Anton K. Rumpf; Council for Individual Freedom: Mr. Charles A. McCarthy; New Jersey Coalition: Mrs. Ralph D. Hacker; Church World Service, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.: Mr. John Schauer; Friends Committee on National Legislation: Mr. Richard Smith; Bible Baptist Church: Rev. Cecil A. Hodges.

August 14, 1964: American Coalition of Patriotic Societies: Mr. John B. Trevor, Jr.; American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service: Bishop Edward Swannstrom.

August 20, 1964: American Committee for Croatian Migration, Inc.: Mr. Joseph V. Bosiljevic, president; Greenwich Women's Republican Club: Mrs. Alice Alessandroni and Mrs. Eleanor Gonzalez; Order Sons of Italy in America: Mr. John Ottaviano, Jr., Mr. Joseph A. L. Errigo, Mr. Samuel A. Culotta, and Dr. Nicholas M. Petruzzelli; National Chinese Welfare Council: Mr. Jack Wong Sing.

August 21, 1964: Liberty Lobby: Mr. W. B. Hicks, Jr.; Northern New Jersey Immigration Conference: Mrs. Arthur Hawkins; Association of Immigration & Nationality Lawyers: Mr. Edward Dubroff; the American Public Health Association, Inc.: Dr. Paul Harper.

September 2, 1964: Women's International League for Peace and Freedom: Mrs. Selma Samole; Japanese-American Citizens League: Mr. Mike Masaoka; Organization for Preservation of Samoan Democracy: Mr. Galumalemana Vailupalo Alalima.

September 3, 1964: The Conservatives: Mr. Sam Baccala; Committee for an Increase in the Spanish Immigration Quota: Hon. Emilio Nunez; Jamaica Progressive League, Inc.: Mrs. Beryl Henry; American Veterans Committee: Mr. Chester G. Shore.

September 11, 1964: Estonian Aid, Inc.: Mr. Erich Park; St. Sophia Greek Orthodox Cathedral: Mr. George J. Charles; American

Civil Liberties Union: Mr. David Carliner; General Board of the Christian Social Concerns of the Methodist Church: Mr. Herman Will, Jr.

September 17, 1964: Mrs. Ruby Curd; Dr. Mollie Ray Carroll; Mrs. J. W. Brabner-Smith; Mrs. Janet Nash.

Statements by: Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO: Mr. Jacob S. Potofsky; National Catholic Welfare Conference, Department of Immigration: Mr. Bruce M. Mohler; Unitarian Universalist Association, Department of Social Responsibility: Mr. Robert E. Jones; United States Committee for Refugees, Inc.: Dr. R. Norris Wilson; National Advocates Society: Mr. Arthur T. Wincek; Polish American Congress: Mr. Charles Rozmarek; The Military Order of the World Wars: Mr. Louis J. Fortier; American Citizens for Sensible, Secure Immigration Laws: Mr. Edward J. Brown; The Epilepsy Foundation: Mr. Harold Babbitt; Mr. George B. Stallings, Jr.; Miss Jane-Fenwick Goodwin; Mr. John R. Northup; Mr. Matthew P. McKeeon.

TESTIMONY

Hon. Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, the Attorney General.

George Warren, Adviser on Refugee Affairs, Department of State.

Hon. Dean Rusk, the Secretary of State.

Hon. W. Willard Wirtz, the Secretary of Labor.

Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER, a Representative in Congress from the State of California.

Dr. Andrew Sackett, Deputy Chief, Bureau of Medical Services, U.S. Public Health Service.

Dr. Louis Jacobs, Chief, Division of Foreign Quarantine, U.S. Public Health Service.

Hon. O. C. FISHER, a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO, a Representative in Congress from that State of Illinois.

Hon. WILLIAM F. RYAN, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York.

Hon. RICHARD T. HANNA, a Representative in Congress from the State of California.

Hon. OGDEN R. REID, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York.

Hon. FRANK J. HORTON, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York.

Hon. KIKI DE LA GARZA, a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas.

Hon. PAUL A. FINO, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York.

Hon. JAMES H. SCHEUER, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York.

Hon. SPARK M. MARSUNGA, a Representative in Congress from the State of Hawaii.

Hon. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, a Representative in Congress from the State of Pennsylvania.

John E. McCarthy, director of the Department of Immigration, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Dr. James M. Read, American Friends Service Committee and Friends Committee on National Legislation.

Mike Masaoka, Japanese-American Citizens League.

Karl Speiss, Sr., Homeowners Federation of Arlington.

John W. Schauer, director of immigration and refugee program of Church World Service.

John B. Trevor, Jr., the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies.

Mrs. Myra C. Hacker, vice president of the New Jersey Coalition, West Englewood, N.J.

Daniel J. O'Connor, chairman, National Americanism Commission, The American Legion.

Mrs. V. J. Alessandroni, Greenwich Women's Republican Club, Old Greenwich, Conn.

Dr. Filindo B. Masino, American Institute for Italian Culture and the Philadelphia Bar Association.

David Carliner, American Civil Liberties Union.

John Ottaviano, Jr., Mr. Joseph Errigo, Mr. Samuel A. Culotta, Dr. Nicholas M. Petruzz-

zelli, and Judge Vito A. Marino, Sons of Italy in America.

Mrs. Jeanne E. Kerbs, Republican Committee of One Hundred, Inc.

Frank E. G. Weil, American Veterans Committee.

Andrew Biemiller, AFL-CIO legislative director, legislative department; accompanied by Mr. Kenneth R. Meiklejohn, legislative representative.

Walter T. Darmpray, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc.

Nicholas S. Limperis, national chairman, AHEPA Immigration Legislation Committee, Order of AHEPA.

Franklin B. Horbelt.

James H. Sheldon, Council for Christian Social Action of the United Church of Christ, and the Committee on Christian Social Action of the New York State Conference of the United Church of Christ.

W. B. Hicks, Liberty Lobby.

Dr. George A. Maxwell.

Miss Lorna Logan, Greater Chinatown Community Association.

STATEMENTS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts.

Hon. SILVIO O. CONTE, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL, a Representative from the State of Michigan.

Hon. HENRY B. GONZALEZ, a Representative from the State of Texas.

Hon. SEYMOUR HALPERN, a Representative from the State of New York.

Hon. JOHN LINDSAY, a Representative from the State of New York.

Hon. RICHARD L. OTTINGER, a Representative from the State of New York.

Hon. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, a Representative from the State of New York.

Hon. PATSY T. MNK, a Representative from the State of Hawaii.

STATEMENTS SUBMITTED BY ORGANIZATIONS

Mrs. Virginia M. Crawford, Michigan Council for Statehood.

Mr. Paul Jennings, president, International Union of Electrical Workers.

Mr. Robert E. Jones, Unitarian Universalist Association.

Mr. Gregory G. Lagakos, Nationalities Service Center of Philadelphia.

Mr. Albert C. Lum, Chinese-American Citizens Alliance, Los Angeles, Calif.

Mr. Charles A. McCarthy, Council for Individual Freedom of the Independence Foundation.

Mr. Aniceto Perez, Committee for the Increase of the Spanish Immigration Quota.

Mrs. Selma Samois, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

Mr. Leon Shull, Americans for Democratic Action.

Mr. Francis W. Stover, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

American Nurses' Association (Mrs. Whitaker).

Mr. Murray I. Gurfein, representing national Jewish organizations listed in statement.

Mr. Tyre Taylor, general counsel, Southern States Industrial Council.

Mr. Donald E. Anderson, Lutheran Immigration Service.

Mr. L. H. Pasqualicchio, president, National Council for American-Italian Friendship.

The Right Reverend Monsignor John F. McCarthy, chairman, Committee on Migration and Refugee Problems, American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, Inc.

STATEMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS

Mr. John R. Northup, Santa Barbara, Calif.

Mr. William G. Rietzer, Washington, D.C.

LETTERS AND RESOLUTIONS

Post 163, American Legion.

United States Day Committee.

August 24, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

20791

Episcopal Diocese of Los Angeles.
Houston Lodge, Chinese-American Citizens Alliance.
American Eugenics Party.
Society for Conservative Political Action.
Steuben Society of America.
United Presbyterian Church.
Women's Republican Club of New Trier Township.
The Jamaica Progressive League.
American Baptist Home Mission Societies.
Minnesota Society of DAR.
German-American Societies of Greater New York.
Greenwich Women's Republican Club.
International Institute of St. Paul.
International Institute of Gary.
International Social Service.
City Council of Philadelphia.
Louisiana Society of the SAR.
Glen Cove Lodge, Sons of Italy.
Lynn, Mass., Lodge 889, Sons of Italy.
Westchester County Board of Supervisors.
Michigan Committee on Immigration.
Community Relations Conference of Southern California.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. NEDZI. I have a brief question.

Do the percentages apply to each country, or do they apply to the entire quota?

Mr. FEIGHAN. The percentages apply to the total. The 170,000 limit external to the United States applies to all countries external to the United States.

Mr. NEDZI. I understand, but so far as each individual country is concerned, for example, could more than 20 percent of the country's immigration be in a particular category?

Mr. FEIGHAN. During the first 3 years, while the quota system remains in effect, not more than 20 percent could be allocated to a given category of any single quota. After the first 3 years any percentage, up to 100 percent could be allocated to a single category for nationals of any country.

Mr. NEDZI. Then the percentages apply worldwide and not so far as a particular country is concerned?

Mr. FEIGHAN. There is no percentage to a particular country. The only limitation on a country is that it will not exceed 20,000, exclusive of spouses, children, and parents of U.S. citizens.

Mr. NEDZI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore].

(Mr. MOORE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, in this very technical field of immigration and certainly an area in which there is intense interest throughout the country, I would like to share very briefly with the Committee some of the difficulties that we on the subcommittee have had in giving our time and attention to the matter which has been before us now some 3 years.

Mr. Chairman, I know of no particular legislation that could be brought to the floor of the House of Representatives in which feelings could run higher in a negative way or perhaps the pressures could be as fierce in a positive way.

It may be a little bit difficult for the membership of a committee to understand exactly what I am getting at, but may I just phrase it in this way: In attempting to do the job that one has and in fulfilling the responsibility that one has as a Member of Congress and as a member of a committee which handles the immigration policy of our country, at times it was even difficult to ask fairly a question of a witness in order to seek a better balance in the record without being accused, simply by reason of tendering the question, of having either an ulterior motive or being adverse to any sort of immigration reform. During the committee's deliberations I was, on more than one occasion, the victim of inaccurate information, because of the manner in which I pointed my questions in attempting to bring a balanced record before us to consider as we began to write the bill, simply because my questions did not always reflect a favorable attitude toward revising or reforming our immigration laws.

Then on the other hand at times when the questions took a more serious note about taking care of some of the inequities and some of the very real discriminations that exist in our law, the pressures exerted themselves the other way. You were then misinformed as being an individual that desired to let down the floodgates and to let all of the mass inflow of possible aliens come into this country that desired to do so.

I am pleased, however, Mr. Chairman, to say that after some 7 years of service on this subcommittee of the House of Representatives, we have come as a subcommittee and as a full committee to this House with a bill which I believe merits the sincere consideration by every Member of this Congress regardless of the area of the country from which he may come and regardless of his political affiliation.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2580 was completely rewritten by the Immigration and Nationalities Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives. It truly is an historic bill. It represents, in my opinion, the bipartisan industry, patience; yes, the skills of the members of the subcommittee.

I think the House should know that during all of these deliberations the matter that was uppermost in all of our minds, and I am speaking of the subcommittee in its entirety, was the interests of the United States. We have concluded unanimously that the national origin strictures can be removed from the immigration law without doing violence to our Nation's immigration policy. The series of tight, close checks upon all who would enter is retained in our immigration law. The proposed amendments include even more restrictive provisions to safeguard the American economy, the American worker, and to preserve generally the well-being of our society and our Nation's security.

Our immigration laws are the most complex upon the statute books. The very complexity of the law has led to

much public confusion and misunderstanding about our immigration policy.

In truth and fact these United States continue and have been in the past the biggest hearted of all the nations of the world in receiving of foreign immigrants. Over the years the ancestors of all of us—some 42 million human beings—have migrated to these shores. To the peoples of Europe chiefly, but to others as well, the United States has long been a haven of opportunity and refuge. The stream of immigrants who have passed through American gates are the Nation's true wealth.

And today, America's true worth and strength rest upon the contributions—morally, politically, socially, economically—of people of many national backgrounds and races. This is the unquestioned genius of the American experience.

In formulating this Nation's immigration policy, the population of the United States, and the available means for sustaining and supporting it must be given first consideration. The best interest of our people must be deemed paramount to that of all others.

The object of our already generous immigration policy is to preserve and maintain the United States as a bright land of liberty, promise, and opportunity. America cannot continue to be that kind of a nation if it becomes overpopulated, socially and economically deteriorated or subverted in its republican form of constitutional government.

Our immigration policy, then, has been generous. Our immigration law is predicated upon the principle that all aliens are admissible into the United States unless there is some provision of the law which requires their exclusion.

That is why our immigration laws are so complex. The underlying purpose of the law is to exclude the inadmissible. That is the underlying purpose of the bill now before you for your consideration—to exclude from our shores the inadmissible and to select for admission only those who can meet the high qualitative and quantitative standards.

Now you may ask why do we need reform of our immigration laws? I happen to believe our national interest and the realities of our immigration practices since World War II require and justify a new immigration selection policy.

In 1921 President Harding signed the first national origin quota act and this act followed by the quota act of 1924 placed into effect a dual selection of immigrants through the application of such standards of admissibility as health, literacy, security, and finances.

The second control on our immigration policy today is restriction of quota immigration to a specified maximum per year based upon their nation of birth. The formula by which immigrants are presently admitted to the United States is embodied in the immigration and nationality act of 1952, the Walter-McCarran Act, and it works like this. The quota of immigrants admissible to the United States from a given country or a quota area in any one year is equal to one-sixth of 1 percent of the number of

20792

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

August 24, 1965

Americans whose national origins was traceable to that country in the census of 1920. This formula is rooted in the variegated pattern of the American people themselves and not in the population of a particular country overseas from which the immigrants come. It was intended to be a rational and logical method of numerically restricting immigration in such a manner as to best preserve the sociological and cultural balance of our population. Yet I say to this committee, the last four American Presidents—President Johnson, President Kennedy, President Eisenhower, and President Truman have all opposed continuation of the national origins feature of our law. Our last four Secretaries of State—Secretary Rusk, Secretary Herter, Secretary Dulles, and Secretary Acheson have urged that our foreign relations demand a change of the immigration law in this respect. Our last four Attorneys General—Messrs. Katzenbach, Kennedy, Rogers, and Brownell have also urged the Congress to change this national origins concept.

You may ask yourself the question—Why? I would say to you the answer is very simple. Because as a device to control immigration by predetermined percentages of national and racial stocks, the national origins system has been a failure and it today is but a fiction.

Since the 1952 law was enacted, only approximately one-third of all aliens admitted to the United States were quota immigrants admitted in accordance with racial or national eligibility.

Furthermore, the symbol of the national origins system, as I have said, has been a fiction over the years since World War II. It has been the basis for attack on our immigration policy and has presented an opportunity for some to misrepresent our Nation's aims in this area when it in fact has had little to do with our immigration pattern since World War II. Therefore the subcommittee unanimously agreed that it should be changed and replaced by immigration reform.

I think the House should know that over 3 million aliens have been admitted to this country as immigrants since 1952. This immigration was achieved in spite of the quota formula of the 1952 act. Nonquota admission, administrative relief, private immigration bills, and a series of emergency and tentative enactments all circumvented the statute of 1952. Of the 3 million immigrants who entered this country since 1952, I call your attention that more than 60 percent have been nonquota entrants into this country, meaning that they have come without the quota system—outside the national origins system. For example, during the 10-year period from 1953 to 1963, a total of 119,677 immigrants came to the United States from China, Japan, and the Philippines and of this figure of 119,677, approximately 109,000 were nonquota immigrants.

These facts may startle those who read our laws and find that Japan has an annual quota of 185, that the Philippines has a quota of 100, and that China has a quota of 205 total per year.

The reason I point this out is, in a way, to verify the statement I have made with respect to the national origins system. Notwithstanding the fact that these countries, as just named—Japan, the Philippines, and China—have a total combined quota of 490, during a 10-year period approximately 119,000 immigrants have come from these three nations.

I should like to submit a table which will be expressive of the manner in which our immigration has not flowed from the national origins channel which was set forth in the 1952 act:

	Annual quota	Immigrants admitted, 1953-62
China-----	100	36,732
Greece-----	308	45,001
Hungary-----	865	55,595
Italy-----	5,666	213,434
Japan-----	185	48,169
Poland-----	6,488	74,669
Portugal-----	438	26,036
Spain-----	250	13,641
Yugoslavia-----	942	37,033

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Supplementing what the gentleman has said, thereby we have sort of chipped off here and chipped off there pieces of the national origins theory. Also, soon after World War II, we passed the Displaced Persons Act, under which we admitted several hundred thousand persons who had been displaced as a result of the terrors of Hitler and Mussolini. Then we passed the Refugee Relief Act. Then we passed the acts giving surcease, succor, and asylum to those victims of the earthquake in the Azores; we admitted those Portuguese.

We admitted the victims of Communist rapine and plunder in Hungary. We admitted the refugees of Holland fleeing the terror of Sukarno in Indonesia.

All those admissions were counter to the theory of national origins. As the gentleman so wisely stated, only one out of every three persons who came into the United States came in under the quota system.

I am sure the gentleman agrees that it is high time we did away with this national origins theory and really called a spade a spade. It has no further efficacy and utility in our system of immigration.

Mr. MOORE. I say to the gentleman that he is eminently correct. I believe this is the area of perhaps widest misunderstanding of our immigration laws today.

There are those in this country who feel that the national origins quota system has been the master of our immigration flow. Certainly since World War II, as the gentleman stated in his question, this has not been true.

As a matter of fact, we propose in the legislation which is suggested here today to call a spade a spade and to make our present immigration law more reflective of our actual immigration practice.

Immediately previous to the gentleman's question I was about to suggest exactly what he has suggested. I had

indicated the numbers that Japan, China, and the Philippines had under the quota system, and the numbers that had come in. I was going to ask how this had been accomplished.

Very frankly, before the ink was dry on the Immigration Act of 1952, early in 1953, Congress recognized that while the displaced persons and refugee resettlement problems had not yet been solved by the Displaced Persons Acts of 1948 and 1950 the new law, which carried forward the national origins formula, left this country without any instrumentality with which to cope with its responsibility in this area. Therefore, we went ahead, and a new refugee admission law was enacted. As a matter of fact, the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 was proposed and quickly passed by the Congress.

It is interesting to note that under that act more than 220,000 refugees came into this country outside the quota system and without regard to the national origins system.

I believe that is a further response to the question of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. The gentleman referred to Japan, China, and the Philippines, and the quota as it has been.

Under this new bill we are now considering what would be the admission situation for those three countries?

Mr. MOORE. These countries would be treated as every other country external to the Western Hemisphere. They would have a maximum limitation placed on them as every other nation has, which is 20,000. I do not want the gentleman to be frightened by that figure of 20,000. It does not mean that that number, 20,000, of Chinese, Japanese, or Filipinos are immediately going to come into this country, but the upper limitation to which they would be entitled would be that number on a first-come, first-served basis, after this law goes fully into effect on July 1, 1968.

Mr. PELLY. Would these three countries get a certain share of the quota for the entire world?

Mr. MOORE. They would not get a certain share of the quota, but would be on an equal footing with intending immigrants from the entire world; that is, each registrant would be treated on a first-come, first-served basis without reference to the country of his birth.

Mr. PELLY. I would like to say to the gentleman that I would not fear that amount of those persons coming in. I have a great amount of Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos in my district. It is not that I register fear that they might come in because they make wonderful citizens. I want to make that clear.

Mr. MOORE. I did not mean to suggest for a moment that was perhaps the gentleman's position, but it is again another wide area of misunderstanding of our immigration laws. People who attack what we are doing here today say that it will let millions of orientals come into the United States. I wanted to place

August 24, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

20793

in the RECORD the observation that there is no one in this House who need fear such an event occurring. In the specific case that the gentleman from Washington refers to, I think he can look forward to an increased number of each of the groups he referred to; but in any event the maximum from any 1 country is 20,000.

Mr. PELLY. I want to thank the gentleman, and in conclusion I would like to say that in our State there was not one single person of Japanese ancestry who had ever been in a penal institution. They make very fine citizens as all the oriental people do. I thank the gentleman again.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOORE. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. ICHORD. The gentleman stated one of the purposes of the bill is to remove discrimination against nationality, but the gentleman from Ohio pointed out that there will be no limitations upon people from South America. Is that not an inconsistency? We are discriminating against all of the countries in the world except the South American countries by the passage of this bill, or at least we are continuing discriminatory provisions.

Mr. MOORE. I think I would say to the gentleman that his last reference is a correct one. By continuing the favored treatment to the Western Hemisphere in this legislation, that is decidedly a preference that is generated in favor of Western Hemisphere immigration. The gentleman is correct in that respect. May I say, and I call to the gentleman's attention the fact that there are areas in this bill in which there are specific provisions inserted for the express purpose of controlling Western Hemisphere immigration even though there is no overall ceiling on Western Hemisphere immigration. We attempted to do that in the subcommittee and you have perhaps heard an account here today as to what occurred there. But this legislation, it should be understood here and now, is much stronger than the present Walter-McCarran Act and the present immigration law in the field of controlling intended immigration and the flow of immigration from the Western Hemisphere countries, including the Caribbean area.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. It might be well to say at this point that during all of the years that we have had restrictive immigration under the Johnson Act and the Walter-McCarran Act since 1924, we have never put a ceiling on immigration from the Western Hemisphere. The current bill continues that open-door policy with reference to the Western Hemisphere.

Secondly, there should be no fear on the part of anyone that there would be a tremendous influx from the Western Hemisphere.

The average intake from the Western Hemisphere has been, in the last 10 years, about 110,000. But, as the gentleman says, there are qualitative restric-

tions. Immigrants must, as under the present law, satisfy the provision that they will not become public charges and secondly, in each instance, in every single instance there must be issued by the Secretary of Labor a certificate to the effect that as to the person coming from the Western Hemisphere, his coming will not have the effect of depressing wages or adversely affecting the conditions of employment.

The consular agent may not issue a visa until and unless the individual who seeks to come into this country assumes the burden of getting that certificate from the Secretary of Labor.

And finally there is in the bill itself—and I think the gentleman from Ohio is responsible for it and deserves great credit for it—the provision that if during any 5-year period there is an indication that the intake of immigrants from the Western Hemisphere is more than 10 percent above the average over 5 years, there shall be a notification sent to Congress, and the Congress may take whatever suitable action it may see fit to take with reference to the situation.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I merely wanted to state that I appreciate the compliment paid by our distinguished chairman, [Mr. CELLER], but that should have gone to the gentleman in the well [Mr. MOORE]. It was just one of the many constructive contributions that the gentleman from West Virginia made to the bill in the subcommittee.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I said "Ohio"; I meant West Virginia.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, in light of the comments recently made by the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. CELLER] about Western Hemisphere immigration—and I have reference to the fact that he said it has not increased very much—perhaps we ought to look at the exact figures.

In 1960 total immigration from the Western Hemisphere was 91,701. In 1963 it had climbed to 147,744, an increase of more than 50 percent in a 4-year period.

If you wish to look more closely at certain segments of the Western Hemisphere, for an example of the dramatic increase of immigration pressure, let us look for a moment at the 10 South American countries and see what the figures are for these countries. I refer specifically to Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela. In 1960 the figure was 11,993; in 1964 almost 28,000, an increase approximating 230 percent over a 5-year period.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that all members of the committee appreciate that the amendment which has

been referred to here by attaching my name to it, and which I offered in full committee and in the subcommittee, is offered with the desire to complete the job that the committee has partially done, of eliminating discrimination. The chairman has correctly said that we have had an open-door policy toward the Western Hemisphere. I do not propose to change the open-door policy. I do propose, however, that we treat all countries of the world at least reasonably alike. I think it is a mistake to further open the door in the Caribbean at the same time that we partially close the door in western Europe. We will, if this bill is passed in its present form, be partially closing the door to the free flow of people to this country from some of our historic allies in western Europe, and will be opening the door to countries not known to be historically friendly or close to us in the Caribbean area.

We are making a change, Mr. Chairman, as far as the Caribbean is concerned, a change that will give them a highly preferential position.

Mr. Chairman, I refer to the fact that Jamaica now has 100 as a ceiling. There are 14,303 registered applicants there who will be coming in, if the administration is friendly to them very shortly after the passage of this bill.

Mr. MOORE. May I say at this point that I would like to move along on this statement rather than diverting completely into a discussion of the Western Hemisphere situation, if I might, but at the same time wanting to yield for the purposes of colloquy.

Mr. CELLER. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia additional time if he needs it.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the gentleman from New York.

May I say with respect to the observations of the gentleman from Minnesota in large part I believe the observations that he has made are without question, certainly true. I think though it would be perhaps a better way, of approaching an answer to the gentleman here to say that what we are doing, rather than opening the door wider, is to continue the past policy as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD] suggested.

The Chairman, it is true without question as each of the former British colonies in this hemisphere seek and obtain their independence there is the continuing question as to what we are going to do in relationship to that nation which is now independent. What we do very frankly in this bill is treat them as an independent nation in the Western Hemisphere, giving them the same rights and privileges that our immigration law has presently included. But we have impressed upon them, I believe it is fair to say, some qualifications and quantitative standards which are not now in present law.

There is—and I think everyone in this House ought to know right now—every reason to believe without question that Western Hemisphere immigration can escalate—can go up. Simply, may I state that that could happen if we were not even here discussing this bill, be-

August 24, 1965

20704

cause of the free flow option that Western Hemisphere countries have had for immigration into the United States.

Beyond that, may I make a further observation, that there is perhaps nothing in the ultimate, but there are several sections of this bill—and may I say specifically, language of which the gentleman in the well is the author, that attempts to restrict the flow of Western Hemisphere migration so that we can continue to have an orderly pattern of immigration worldwide including the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Chairman, I had started to talk about the question of how in the world we got so many immigrants outside of the national origins system. May I say to the House and to this committee that that imbalance about which you hear today has been a situation which has existed since 1957 and some here perhaps have had an opportunity of having voted in the affirmative to encourage an expansion of our immigration programs from 1957 forward. You have had since 1957, and every year since, broad new laws admitting, outside of the national origins system, highly skilled specialists, relatives of U.S. citizens, and permanent resident aliens, as well as refugees, into this country. Always, however, on a piecemeal basis, never reaching the real core of the problem.

In 1958 the Congress passed four such laws. In 1959 we granted nonquota status to relatives of U.S. citizens, and residents who had been on the waiting list for 10 to 15 years, without regard to the national origins system.

The act of July 14, 1960, admitted more Portuguese and more Dutchmen, as well as authorized the paroling of refugees with the built-in provision permitting the Attorney General to adjust their status to that of permanent residence after they had spent 2 years in the United States.

In the 87th Congress, under the act of 1961, expedited the reuniting of families, and we moved the date up in that particular instance to give nonquota status to certain of those registered in the quota areas. So, each step that the Congress itself has made has, in effect, done violence to the national origins concept, as far as our immigration laws are concerned.

In short, I think it is fair to say that every Member of this body who has been here since 1957 has time and again, it is my recollection, supported time and again, the expansion of our immigration policies, and a further drifting away from the national origins concept.

May I say to the members of this Committee the bill before you today places its first emphasis on the reuniting of families, and merits your consideration.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman speaks properly when he inveighs against the national origins concept. I have been fighting against the national origin concept for four decades. As I indicated

before, one of my first speeches in the halls of Congress was against the national origins theory, and I think it is a shame my voice fell on deaf ears. I felt like the Greek, Sisyphus, who was condemned to push a boulder up a hill. Every time he got to the top the boulder would fall on top of him, and he tumbled down with the boulder. That is how I have felt all these years; but now I am apparently being able, with the gentleman's help and the help of most of the Members of this House, I am sure, particularly the members of the subcommittee, in succeeding in getting that boulder over the hill.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman in the well to clarify a response given to the gentleman from Washington as to the precise number to which information is going to be in detail. I believe the gentleman says that the number of immigrants permitted from any country is going to be a proportion of those registered in that country to the total registered in the world.

What is the time, or at what period of time is that going to be determined? Obviously this proportion is going to be changed.

Mr. MOORE. That would be those who were on the waiting list as of July 1, 1968. We have built into this bill a mechanism whereby we attempt to clean out all of the waiting lists so that on July 1, 1968, there will not be an immigrant who is in a preference category now and waiting to come who will be left there waiting to come in on that day. So that from July 1, 1968, forward all immigration will be on a first-come, first-serve basis. It will be on an even flow.

Mr. NEDZI. That is the question I asked the gentleman—whether it will be on a first-come, first-served basis or on a proportionate basis.

Mr. MOORE. It will be on a first-come, first-served basis—and certainly based upon the numbers or the registration in existence or that is built up in any one of those nations. It is mathematically conceivable that by July 1, 1968, there might be 20,000 registrants from a single country, who have prior registrations as against all other registrants for immigration in the world, and if so they will come in first.

Mr. NEDZI. In other words, it would be regardless of the proportion of those registered in China as compared to the entire world?

Mr. MOORE. That is right. The gentleman is correct and, if I have misled him, I appreciate the gentleman asking questions to clear it up.

Mr. NEDZI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE. May I say with respect to the objectives of the new system which we are suggesting here today, and which the committee is considering, the major principal changes proposed by this bill are to eliminate the selection of immigrants on the basis of ancestry or place of birth, and to substitute the test of

selection based upon concepts of family reunion, and the immigrant's potential personal contribution to the United States—standards which we believe are fair to the aliens and by the same token more beneficial to America.

Additionally the bill provides a continuing and flexible authority for the admission of refugees. The Committee on the Judiciary in the amended bill, H.R. 2580, has achieved this reform with restrictive safeguards to protect the general well being of our Nation, our economic health and our national security.

There were a lot of suggestions that were rejected by the subcommittee and the full committee. May I take just a moment to set the record straight in that respect.

The original administration bill provided for a wide grant of discretionary control over our immigration system. Under that proposal the executive could have used up to one-half of the quota numbers at his discretion. In the name of national security or diplomatic policy, the admission of aliens could have been subject to all sorts of political pressures internally and externally so far as this Nation's immigration policy is concerned. But this proposal was rejected. Your committee preserved for the Congress, and I say this without a moment's hesitation—your committee preserved for the Congress its traditional and its historic responsibility and its constitutional prerogative. That is the function of determining this Nation's immigration policy.

Also it might be well to point out that the original administration measure would have created a joint executive and legislative advisory immigration board. This unworkable monstrosity is a clear violation of the theory in my opinion of the separation of powers upon which our Government is based and this was also rejected by the Immigration and Nationality subcommittee as an unnecessary duplication and certainly as an obvious effort to weaken the congressional control of our immigration policy.

Further, the administration proposal would also have granted to the executive virtually unrestricted control and authority for the admission of refugees. This particular suggested change by the administration was rejected by the subcommittee. I say to the Committee, for the first time in this amended bill, H.R. 2580, we have set a specific numerical limit upon the admission of refugees and the Congress of the United States—not some international body—will establish the qualifying definition for the term "refugee."

Other provisions rejected by the subcommittee would have removed the restriction and suspension of deportation and adjustment of status for alien crewmen and ship jumpers, and would have changed the date from 1940 to 1952 as the date for the creation of a record of admission for those illegally in the United States.

The administration proposal would have removed the restriction against admission of feeble minded, insane and those of psychopathic personality. Under these proposals which were rejected,

August 24, 1965

and I emphasize this, by the subcommittee and the full committee, thousands of persons underground now in the United States—subversives perhaps—deserting crewmen and criminals would have been given an opportunity to legalize their presence in the United States. This subcommittee and your full committee did not let this happen.

I think it well to set up here the highlights of the new system. For the 3-year period from 1965 to 1968 the total quota of immigration remains at 158,561. High quota countries as Great Britain, Germany, and Ireland retain their quotas for this transition period.

Unused quota numbers from 1964 are brought forward for use this year to help liquidate the preference waiting list in oversubscribed countries. This is also in operation for the year 1966 and 1967. What we have done is to create an immigration pool of those numbers which are not now used. And they have not been used for a long number of years in our immigration pattern.

Of the total of 158,561 we have had as a basis for entry into this country, only about 98,000 have been used, and the balance, or about 60,000, have gone by default and at the end of each year have been lost to any intending immigrants.

What we do by this provision in the bill is recapture those numbers for a 3-year period and permit the Secretary of State to reallocate those numbers to immigrants who have been waiting in the preference categories for long periods of time. We permit the reissuance of those numbers in order that on July 1, 1968, we will have cleaned out this long category of individuals who are family members, who have skills which entitle them to preference consideration under the present law. We will give them expedited entry into the United States.

May I say here and now that somebody is going to say that this is going to bring into this country a great number of people in the next 3 years. By using this particular mechanism I want everybody in this committee to know that we are not doing anything for that intending immigrant that the passage of time would not do for him anyhow. He already has a preference category. With the passage of time, if we never did anything to the immigration law, that intending immigrant would come to the United States of America.

What we are doing is relieving a pressure point of this vast buildup of intending immigrants in preference categories who have been waiting for years—the last count could well go back to 1955—and we are going to clean that up over the next 3 years, so that by July 1, 1968, we will be able to establish an orderly pattern of immigration on a first-come, first-served basis.

The subcommittee recognized that this was one of the real pressure points for reform. It came from the long list of relatives, from those already qualified and eligible, just sitting and waiting for a number to come up.

We will recapture the unused numbers and give them out to the oversubscribed countries, meaning to those who could

not come by reason of quota numbers being exhausted. We will expedite their entry into the United States. But, in effect, we will not be giving them anything the passage of time would not give them.

During the 3-year transition period no country except Great Britain, Germany, and Ireland could receive more than 20,000 visas from the quota plus the unused carryover pool. We include that in the limitation. It is exclusive of spouses and children and parents of U.S. citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has again expired.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I might pause here to say that what we have done also is to continue some sections of the present law, and we have added parents as nonquota immigrants, parents of U.S. citizens as nonquota immigrants. We now will place them in the category of wives, spouses and children of U.S. citizens.

A new set of preferences will go into effect on the effective date of this proposed bill. These preferences, as I have stated, emphasize family reunion first and foremost. The first two categories of the eight set up in this bill give their first attention to the reuniting of families.

A new class is created covering the professions, scientists, and other alien applicants with high education and training, as distinguished from the skills and crafts needed in the United States, which are put in a lower preference bracket.

In addition, we have created a new preference class for refugees, with a maximum annual ceiling of 10,200, and we have returned the "parole" section of the law to its original intent, so that there cannot be flexibility or playing with the number of those intending to come into the country by utilization of certain areas of the law which it was not the intent of the Congress be used for determination of admission of immigrants.

The limit of 170,000 is established on the number of immigrants we will take from all countries external to the Western Hemisphere. Since the ceiling of 170,000 includes the 10,200 refugees, the net increase—this is something Members should be interested in—over the present quota of 158,561 is approximately 1,200 numbers or 1,200 visas or 1,200 immigrants, whichever way one desires to translate it.

In this proposed legislation new and stricter labor controls are included in the amended bill which require that the Secretary of Labor must make an affirmative ruling that all immigrants other than the relative preference classes and refugees will not compete with an American worker for employment opportunities in the specific locations of the country where there are job openings, and will not upset competitive wage rates.

A new orphan section provision consolidates three sections in the present

law to provide a clear-cut definition of an eligible orphan.

Epilepsy was removed as a ground for exclusion because the committee's testimony indicated that it is not communicable and can be controlled with modern medication.

A new class of excluded areas was also created, which includes those that today have, or participate in, some sort of sexual deviation. We have added that to the phrase, psychopathic personality, and also given attention to the question of physical persecution as a ground for suspension of deportation.

Still another tightening up provision in the amended bill is the requirement that the President must report to the Congress any time the Western Hemisphere immigration should increase substantially. Specifically the language of the bill is in any year that immigration from the Western Hemisphere shall increase by 10 percent over the annual average immigration in the Western Hemisphere for the last 5 years; the President of the United States shall report the same to the Congress with any recommendations he may make, if any, to handle this situation.

May I conclude by saying for the members of the committee that in my judgment H.R. 2580, as amended by the subcommittee and approved by the full committee, provides for a much stronger and more constructive and fairer immigration system than this country has ever had. I am pleased to have played a minor part in bringing this bill to the Congress and to the floor of the House for your consideration, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO].

(Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this legislation with a profound sense of pardonable pride and satisfaction. This is a day I have looked forward to for 17 years. This is legislation I have worked for since I first entered Congress in 1949.

To the members of the Judiciary Committee, and especially to my colleagues on the Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee, and our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], I pay tribute now for a job well done.

And particularly I must single out for praise the enlightened statesmanship of the distinguished dean of the House and chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. Through years of discouragement and struggle he has carried forward the torch of hope that our outdated and discriminatory immigration laws would some day be discarded and replaced by policies that would meet America's need in this scientific and technological era and that would be in accord with our country's traditions and ideals.

The legislation before us today will accomplish these objectives. And it will do justice to American humanity and conscience.

20796

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 24, 1965

We cannot look back at our past immigration policy with any pride. It was shortsighted, discriminatory and, moreover, unworkable. The core of that inflexible and inequitable policy is the national origins quota system.

This system was conceived 40 years ago, when a pattern of discrimination prevailed. During the first decade of the 20th century, the vast increase of immigration to the United States created an uneasiness, an uneasiness accentuated during periods of economic crisis; then the perplexities in the wake of World War I abetted the already existing but baseless fear of the unknown.

Yet year after year, since 1924, events have shown the futility of existing law. The needs of our country and of other countries resulting from wars, revolutions, and natural disasters could not break through the barrier of the quota bonds. Again and again emergency legislation has been called for, and Congress has acted painfully and reluctantly. And, of course, each new enactment has taken some of the substance from existing law.

Following World War II we passed two Displaced Persons Acts; then in 1953 the Refugee Relief Act. In 1958 we had to enact special legislation to grant permanent residence to the Hungarian refugee victims of Soviet terrorism in the 1956 uprising. Two laws—in 1958 and again in 1960—had to be passed to deal with the problem of Portuguese victims of the earthquake in the Azores and the Dutch expelled from Indonesia. Since 1957, in fact, every Congress has been called upon to enact legislation to meet needs impossible to fulfill within the rigid quota system. These laws have covered highly skilled specialists, relatives of U.S. citizens and permanently residing aliens, as well as refugees.

These continuing breaches in the quota wall show beyond doubt that it now remains on the legislative books as nothing but a testament to chaos and disorder.

In every new Congress, since I came to the House in 1949, I have introduced bills to repeal the odious national origins quota system—a system that by its discrimination and inflexibility is an injustice to thousands of citizens and residents separated from their loved ones. The daily contact that we on the Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee have with private bills reemphasizes the need to reunite families and is a forcible reminder of the miserable anticipation caused by separation.

Perhaps I have been particularly close to the plight of many of our citizens who have been unable to have their families join them from overseas. And this plight has not fallen equally on all citizens.

Mr. Chairman, how can we, as Americans, explain to another American that his mother or father must wait years before coming to the United States, when there are countries with large quotas that go unused? And how explain to this same American that the parents of his next-door neighbor can immediately join their son, solely by virtue of their place of birth?

The provisions of H.R. 2580 which eliminate the national origins quota system express the true concepts of freedom and equality for which this country stands. This long overdue change recognizes the dignity of the individual and is predicated on the principle that one person is no less desirable than any other person regardless of his race or place of birth.

The arguments in favor of a closed-door policy have been repeated over and over again since the days of John Adams, in spite of the fact that our periods of greatest expansion have invariably coincided with our periods of greatest immigration. But the record shows the role which immigrants have played in pushing our frontier westward and in building the industrial machine which is the greatest the world has ever seen. We know that immigration is good for the country in terms of national wealth, national culture, national productivity and national defense.

Surely one of the greatest sources of the strength of America is to be found in the diversity of the groups making up our Nation. Each group has brought its traditions, its culture, its individual genius, and these in turn have become part of the American heritage. Diversity marks the various contributions to this heritage; unity has been the outgrowth of a shared experience, of shared values. The American Nation today stands as eloquent proof that there is no inherent contradiction between unity and diversity. And the peoples coming to our shore have been seekers only of the very objectives upon which our Nation was founded—human dignity and opportunity.

An argument repeatedly raised against immigration reform is that it would contribute to unemployment here. But this stems from the old days of mass immigration when there was a tendency for immigrants to accept lower wages and inferior working conditions. In these days of strong unions and Government safeguards, these dangers have largely disappeared. And it is important to emphasize that immigrants today are generally not the uneducated, unskilled people who came here in the past. Quota immigrant workers are predominantly educated and skilled. Moreover, it is estimated that only about one immigrant out of three additional immigrants who would be admitted would enter the labor market. In testimony on this legislation last year, then Attorney General Kennedy stated that "immigrants today bring to this country and spend a great deal more than they take in wages."

In his message to Congress this year President Johnson said the quota system "is incompatible with our basic American tradition." And earlier President Kennedy stated, in urging its elimination, that it "neither satisfies a national need nor accomplishes an international purpose."

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today is the result of painstaking study and review of our immigration policy. Extensive hearings were held last year, as well as during March, April, May, and June

of this year. No person or organization desiring to testify was denied that opportunity.

In addition to this testimony already a part of the record, I would like to call to the attention of my distinguished colleagues on both sides of the aisle the impressive and widespread support for this measure as indicated by the membership of the National Committee for Immigration Reform.

This nonpartisan citizens' committee lists among its membership some of the best known and respected names in America—who have joined together as individuals—in support of long overdue immigration reform. In addition to former Presidents Truman and Eisenhower, the membership includes two former Secretaries of the Treasury—Douglas Dillon and Robert Anderson, two former Attorneys General—Herbert Brownell and Howard McGrath, former Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan and former HEW Secretary Marion Folsom. The committee further includes leaders in the fields of religion, business, labor, education, science, communications, agriculture, and social welfare from all sections of our country.

Letters of invitation to join the committee were sent out in early May over the signature of the Honorable Robert Murphy, former Under Secretary of State and Ambassador, with a long and distinguished career in public and diplomatic service. The letters were written in behalf of Walker L. Cislser, chairman of the Detroit Edison Co.; George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO; and Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the Radio Corp. of America—all members of this committee. Nathan Straus III, New York civic leader, is chairman.

I invite your attention to the full-page advertisement which appeared in the Washington Post this morning, Tuesday, August 24—listing this committee's membership and its message on immigration reform. The committee statement points out that four American Presidents—Johnson, Kennedy, Eisenhower and Truman—have all opposed continuation of the discriminatory and outmoded national origins quota system in our immigration law. It further states that the primary purpose of the administration's immigration program is to change the method of selection of immigrants; that it does not significantly increase numbers of immigrants; that it protects American workers against job competition and it retains all of the health, security, literacy and moral requirements of the present law.

The committee's message states:

The principles supported by the National Committee for Immigration Reform are embraced in H.R. 2580, as amended and reported by the House Judiciary Committee. We urge immediate passage of this bill without any basic changes.

I would like to insert this full-page advertisement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point for the benefit of my colleagues, who may have missed it. And at the appropriate time I will ask unanimous consent that the full text of the advertisement be printed.

August 24, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 24, 1965]

LEADING AMERICANS SPEAK OUT FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM NOW

"I hope that both Houses of Congress will wash away a stain on our national conscience and in its place engrave the mark of a just and hopeful country."—President Johnson, August 3, in reiterating the need for early enactment of the administration's immigration reform program.

Four American Presidents—Johnson, Kennedy, Eisenhower, and Truman—have all opposed continuance of the discriminatory and outmoded national origins quota system in our national immigration law.

The primary purpose of the administration's immigration reform program is to change the method of selection of immigrants. It does not significantly increase the number of immigrants; protects American workers against job competition; and retains all of the health, security, literacy, and moral requirements of the present law.

The principles supported by the National Committee for Immigration Reform are embraced in H.R. 2580, as amended and reported by the House Judiciary Committee. We urge immediate passage of this bill without any basic changes.

Hon. Dwight D. Eisenhower; Hon. Robert B. Anderson; Hon. J. Howard McGrath; Hon. Douglas Dillon; Hon. Charles F. Brannan; Hon. Harry S. Truman; Hon. Herbert Brownell; Hon. Marion B. Folsom.

Nathan Strauss III, chairman; Organizing Committee; Walker L. Cislser, chairman, Detroit Edison Co.; George Meany, president, AFL-CIO; Robert Murphy, chairman, Corning Glass International; David Sarnoff, chairman, Radio Corp. of America; I. W. Abel, president, United Steelworkers of America; Harry Akin, president, Night Hawk Restaurants; Dr. H. R. Albrecht, president, North Dakota State University of Agriculture; Hon. Winthrop W. Aldrich, former U.S. Ambassador to England; S. C. Allyn, former chairman, National Cash Register Co.; Frank Altschul, vice president, Council of Foreign Relations, Inc.; Gustave C. Amsterdam, president, Bankers Securities Corp.; Hon. Eugene Anderson, former U.S. Minister to Bulgaria; Hon. Robert B. Anderson, former Secretary of the Treasury; Albert E. Arant; Steve Ashcraft, president, Craft's Drug Stores; Harold L. Bache, senior partner, Bache & Co.; Max W. Bay, M.D.; Jefferson A. Beayer; Robert B. Begley, president, Begley Drug Co.; J. A. Beltrne, president, Communications Workers of America; Mrs. George L. Bell; Robert S. Benjamin, chairman of the board, United Artists Corp.; Dr. John C. Bennett, president, Union Theological Seminary; William Benton, publisher and chairman, Encyclopedia Britannica; Leonard Bernstein, conductor, pianist, composer; Dr. Hans A. Bethe, professor, Cornell University; Hon. Nicholas D. Biddle; Walter H. Bleringer, executive vice president, Plymouth Rubber Co.; Barry Bingham, publisher, Louisville Courier-Journal; Joseph P. Binns; Rev. Eugene C. Blake, stated clerk, United Presbyterian Church; Jacob Blaustein; Joseph L. Block, chairman, Inland Steel Co.; Sam R. Bloom; Mrs. Virginia K. Bloomgarden.

George M. Bragalina, vice president, Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co.; Harry Brandt, Brandt Theaters; Hon. Charles F. Brannan, former Secretary of Agriculture; R. James Brennan; Dr. Detlev W. Bronk, president, the Rocke-

ller Institute; John G. Broumas, Broumas Theaters; Hon. Herbert Brownell, former U.S. Attorney General; Margaret J. Buckley, regent, Catholic Daughters of America; Rev. Edward B. Bunn, S.J., chancellor, Georgetown University; George Burden, president, United Rubber Workers of America; Dr. Shrum Burton, Methodist pastor; Cass Canfield, publishing company executive; Fred H. Carmichael, president, Carmichael & Co.; Kenneth F. C. Char, president, Aloha Airlines, Inc.; Leo Cherne, director, Research Institute of America, Inc.; George L. Chumbley, Jr., vice president, Battery Park Hotel; Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, director, Department of Psychology, City College, City University of New York; Abram Claude, vice president, Morgan Guaranty Trust Co.; Gen. Lucius D. Clay, U.S. Army, retired; Jacob Clayman, administrative director, Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO; Benjamin V. Cohen, former member, U.S. Delegation to U.N.; Rev. David G. Colwell, pastor, First Congregational United Church of Christ; Henry S. Commager, professor, history of America studies, Amherst College; Charles O. Conrad, the Morning Pioneer, Mandan, N. Dak.; Donald C. Cook, president, American Electric Power Co., Inc.; Thomas M. Cooley II, dean, University of Pittsburgh School of Law; Hon. Edward Corsi; Glenn M. Coulter; Norman Cousins, editor, Saturday Review; Gardner Cowles, chairman, Cowles Magazines & Broadcasting; Harry B. Cunningham, president, S. S. Kresge; Joseph Curran, president, National Maritime Union of America.

Most Reverend Richard Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston; Edward L. Cushman, Vice President, American Motors Corp.; J. De Cubas, President, Westinghouse Electric International Co.; Thomas J. Deegan, Jr., Chairman, Thos. J. Deegan Co.; Dr. Fred Delliquadri, Dean, Columbia University; Dr. John Dickey, President, Dartmouth College; Hon. Douglas Dillon, former Secretary of the Treasury; Carling Dinkler, Jr., Chairman, Dinkler Hotel Corp.; Rt. Rev. Horace W. B. Donegan, Bishop of New York; Morgan J. Doughton, Chairman, Managerial Dynamics, Inc.; Hon. Lewis W. Douglas, former U.S. Ambassador to England; R. E. Driscoll, Jr.; David Dubinsky, President, International Ladies Garment Worker's Union; Allen W. Dulles, former Director, Central Intelligence Agency; Alfred H. Edelson, President, Rytex Co.; Herbert B. Ehrmann; Rabbi Maurice Elensdrath, President, Union of American Hebrew Congregation; Hon. Dwight D. Eisenhower; Milton L. Elsborg, President, Drug Fair; George M. Elsey, National Council, U.S. Committee for Refugees; Paul C. Emple, Executive Director, National Lutheran Council; Edward J. Ennis; Everett H. Erick, Vice President, American Broadcasting-Paramount Theaters; Dr. Luther H. Evans, Director, International and Legal College, Columbia University; Hon. James A. Farley, Chairman, Coca Cola Export Corp.; James E. Faust; William J. Feldstein; Mrs. Laura Fermi; Max M. Fisher; Hon. E. H. Foley; Frank M. Folsom, Chairman, Executive Committee, RCA; Hon. Marion B. Folsom, former Secretary, Health, Education, and Welfare; John B. Ford III; Dr. George W. Forell, Professor, Protestant Theology, University of Iowa; Berent Friele, Director, Council on Foreign Relations; Jack Fruchtman, Fruchtman Theaters.

Dr. John Kenneth Galbraith, Professor, Harvard University; Buell G. Gallagher, President, the City College of City University of New York; Sylvester J. Garamella; Gen. James M. Gavin, Chairman, Arthur D. Little, Inc.; Benjamin Gim; Bruce A. Gimbel, President, Gimbel Bros.; Harry Golden, Editor, The Carolina Israelite; Eric F. Goldman; Samuel Goldwyn, Motion Picture Producer; Harry E. Gould, Chairman, Universal American Corp.; William P. Gray; Arnold S. Gregory; John J. Grogan, President, Industrial Union of Marine Workers; Mason W. Gross, President, Rutgers University; Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther; Murray Gurfeln; S. A. Haines, Personnel Manager, Sears, Roebuck & Co.; Paul Hall, President, The Seafarers International Union; James A. Hamilton, Associate Director, Washington, National Council of Churches; Oscar Handlin, Director, Center for Study of History, Harvard University; John W. Hanes, Jr., Former Assistant Secretary of State; John A. Hannah, President, Michigan State University; Bryce N. Harlow, Director, Governmental Relations, Procter & Gamble; Marion Harper, Jr.; Mechel F. Harris, Chairman Kansas City, Mo., Immigration Committee; George M. Harrison, Chief Executive, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks; Thomas B. Harvey; John C. Hazen, vice president, National Retail Merchants Association; August Heckscher, director, the 20th Century Fund; Donald E. Heiges, president, Lutheran theological Seminary; Ben W. Heine-man, chairman, Chicago & North Western Railway Co.; Ernest Henderson, chairman, Sheraton Corp. of America; Stewart W. Herman, president Lutheran School of theology at Chicago; Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, president, University of Notre Dame; Jane M. Hoey; Mrs. Anna Rosenberg Hoffman.

Sidney Hollander, Vice President, Council of Social Work Education; Mrs. Hiram Cole Houghton, Former Deputy Director, ICA; Palmer Hoyt, Publisher, The Denver Post; Archbishop Iakovos, Greek Orthodox Archdiocese; Paul Jennings, President, International Union of Electrical Workers; Devereux C. Josephs; J. M. Kaplan, President, J. M. Kaplan Foundation; Jerome J. Keating, President, National Association of Letter Carriers; Joseph D. Keenan, Secretary, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; Herman Kenin, President, American Federation of Musicians; Dr. Clark Kerr, President, University of California; Mrs. Marcus Kilch, President, National Council of Catholic Women; Robert C. Kirkwood, Chairman, F. W. Woolworth Co.; Robert Huntington Knight, former Deputy Secretary of Defense; Alfred A. Knopf, Publisher; David Lloyd Kreeger, President, Government Employees Insurance Co.; Arthur B. Krim, President, United Artists Corp.; Most Rev. John J. Krol, Archbishop of Philadelphia; C. B. Larsen, Chairman, Ex. Comm., Cunningham Drug Stores, Inc.; Sidney Lawrence; Ralph Lazarus, President, Federated Department Stores, Inc.; K. G. Lee, the Chinese Journal; Robert Lehman, Lehman Bros.; Samuel D. Leidesdorf; Sid B. Levine; D. M. Lilly, President, Toro Manufacturing Co.; Sol M. Linowitz, Chairman, Zerox Corp.; Thacher Longstreth; Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, former U.S. Delegate, U.N. General Assembly; Mrs. Clare Booth Luce, former Ambassador to Italy; Henry R. Luce, Publisher; L. C. Lustenberger,

August 24, 1965

President, W. T. Grant Co.; Mrs. Florence Mahoney; Julius Manger, Jr., Chairman, Manager Hotel Co.; Judge Juvenal Marchisio; Stanley Marcus, Nelman-Marcus.

George M. Mardikian, Mardikian Enterprises; Rev. Dr. Julius Mark, senior Rabbi, Congregation Emanu-El; Michael F. Markel; Woodrow D. Marriott, Marriott-Hot Shoppes, Inc.; Joseph Martin, Jr.; John E. McCarthy, director, Immigration Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference; Paul M. McCloskey, Jr.; Ralph McGill, publisher, the Atlanta Ga., Constitution; Hon. J. Howard McGrath, former U.S. Attorney General; John J. McGrath; Most Rev. James Cardinal McIntyre, Archbishop of Los Angeles; George Meany, president, AFL-CIO; Samuel W. Meek; Dr. William C. Menninger, president, The Menninger Foundation; Yehudi Menuhin, violinist; James A. Michener, author; Mrs. Helen Kirkpatrick Milbank; Maurice B. Mitchell, president, Encyclopedia Britannica; Howard Moore, Jr.; Arturo Morales-Carrion, Pan American Union; Edward P. Morgan, writer-news commentator; Robert Mortvedt, president, Pacific Lutheran University; Hon. Teodoro Moscoso, former Ambassador to Venezuela; Robert Moses; Hon. Luis Munoz Marin; Mrs. Ruth Z. Murphy; Hon. Robert Murphy, chairman, Corning Glass International; Rev. John Courtney Murray, S.J., Woodstock College; Most Rev. Patrick O'Boyle, Archbishop of Washington; James E. O'Brien; Roderic L. O'Connor, vice president, Ciba Corp.; Robert S. Oelman, chairman, National Cash Register Co.; Frederick O'Neal, president, Actor's Equity Association; John Ottaviano, Jr., Order Sons of Italy in America; H. A. Overstreet, author, college professor; Mrs. H. A. Overstreet; William S. Paley, chairman, Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.

James G. Patton, president, National Farmers' Union; Mrs. Malcolm E. Peabody, Cambridge, Mass.; Drew Pearson; Jay Pfothenauer; Roland Pierotti, executive vice president, Bank of America; Rt. Rev. James A. Pike; Bishop of California; Philip W. Pillsbury, chairman, the Pillsbury Co.; William Pollock, president, Textile Workers Union of America; Fortune Pope, publisher, *Il Progresso*; Jacob S. Potofsky, president, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; George D. Pratt, Jr.; Maxwell M. Rabb, former Assistant to President Eisenhower; Sidney A. Rand, President, St. Olaf College; I. S. Raydin, M.D.; James M. Read, President, Wilmington College; Whitelaw Reid, Director, New York Herald-Tribune; Walter P. Reuther, President, United Automobile Workers; Irving G. Rhodes, Wisconsin Jewish Chronicle; Emil Rieve, member, Executive Council, AFL-CIO; David Rockefeller, President, Chase Manhattan Bank; Mrs. Mary G. Roebeling, Chairman, Trenton Trust Co.; Harry N. Rosenfield; Lessing J. Rosenwald; William Rosenwald; Pierre Salinger, Vice President, National General Corp.; Jonas Salk, M.D., Salk Institute for Biological Studies; Col. Irving Salomon; Howard J. Samuels, President Kordite Corp.; Gen. David Sarnoff, Chairman, Radio Corporation of America; Stuart T. Saunders, Chairman, Pennsylvania Railroad; Dore Schary, Motion Picture Producer; Harry Scherman, author; Frederik A. Schlotz, President, the American Lutheran Church; Arthur Schlesinger,

Jr., Historian; Charles H. Schneider, Editor, Memphis Press-Scimitar; Milton J. Shapp, Chairman, the Jerrold Corp.

Jack Sheehan, Legislative Representative, United Steelworkers of America; Mrs. Harper Sibley, Rochester, N.Y.; Norton Simon; Ross D. Siragusa, Chairman, Admiral Corp.; Gen. Carl A. Spaatz, USAF, retired; William B. Spann, Jr.; Philip Sporn, Chairman, System Division, American Electric Power Co.; Ceslovas Staniulis, American-Lithuanian Engineers Association; Philip M. Stern, Author, Former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State; Mark C. Stevens, Vice President Detroit Bank & Trust; Nathan Straus, III, Director, Straus-Duparquet Inc.; Alan M. Stroock; Walter Sterling Surrey; Benjamin H. Swig, Chairman, Fairmont Hotel; Charles P. Taft; Dr. Edward Teller, Professor, University of California; Dr. Paul Tillich, Professor, University of Chicago Divinity School; Maynard J. Toll; Dr. William P. Tooley, Chancellor, Syracuse University; Ben Touster; Hon. Harry S. Truman; Maxwell M. Upson; William J. Vanden Heuvel; Frank J. Vodrazka, President Czechoslovak Society of America; Thomas J. Watson, Jr., Chairman, International Business Machines Co.; Sidney J. Weinberg; Hon. Edwin L. Weisl, Sr.; Edwin J. Wesely, New York City; Dr. Gilbert F. White, Professor, University of Chicago; Paul Dudley White, M.D.; Edward S. Wikera, M.D.; Roy Wilkins, Executive Director NAACP; Harvey Williams, President, The Company for Investing Abroad; Walter F. Wolbrecht, Executive Director, Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod; Hon. Stanley Woodward; Jerry Wurf, President American Federal, State, City, and Municipal Employees; James Kanell Zolotas.

NOTE.—Persons included on this list are serving in their individual capacities.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM,

Washington, D.C. (202) 232-0252.

Gladys Uhl, Director of Information.

H.R. 2580 will establish a system of selectivity designed with equality and flexibility. Priority is given to the reunification of families and the admission of much needed skills. Service to our national interest and service to human interest is paramount in this new system based on logic, reason and humanity.

We will not be admitting substantially more immigrants. Times and conditions have changes. We must be able to provide for those who come here—with jobs, with homes, with futures. These are the limitations on our welcome, and they are necessary for the well-being of the United States. With this bill we will achieve an equitable and realistic policy that conveys the generosity and warmth of the American people and which best serves the national interest of the Nation, both domestically and internationally.

The question of immigration is so basic to our welfare, so basic to our international relations, and so basic to the growth and development of this country that we must make every effort to place present and future national needs above the garbled echoes of past prejudices.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge passage of H.R. 2580. For with its passage we will demonstrate to the world that we are still the kind of land which can grow

and develop dynamically and generously. And thus we shall most effectively proclaim the blessings of liberty throughout the world.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, this is a task of great satisfaction for me, as well as for scores of other Members of this House who have carried on the fight for many years to strike the national origins quota provisions from our immigration laws. I have been introducing legislation for this purpose since I was first elected to this House nearly 13 years ago.

But there is one Member among us whose cause this is more than it is anyone else's now serving in Congress. I speak, of course, of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, whose name is on the bill we are now considering. Our colleague from New York, EMANUEL CELLER, was here when the national origins quota system was adopted more than 40 years ago. He fought against it then and he has fought against it continuously ever since.

The Celler-Lehman bill, which was first introduced over a decade ago, set the pattern for the pending bill.

This Congress, I am certain, will see the successful termination of the national origins struggle. Nothing could be more fitting than that EMANUEL CELLER's name be engraved upon the bill which will mean victory in this struggle when it is finally approved.

It would be belaboring the obvious for me to repeat the list of grievances against the national origins quota system. The bill of particulars has been expressed many times before and is familiar to us all. The system is not only unnecessarily unjust and discriminatory, it has also proven unworkable and unable to achieve its intended purpose.

The evidence on these two points is overwhelming. How can a system which assigns two-thirds of its quota numbers to only three moderately sized countries, while leaving all other quota countries large and small to share in the remaining one-third be defended on principle? It cannot. And because it is based upon false principles it has not worked. Only two-thirds of the quota numbers available have been used in recent years, while the waiting lists for quota visas have built up into tremendous backlogs in many of the low-quota countries.

Congress has recognized the shortcomings of this system and has enacted numerous special immigration laws to overcome emergency situations that have arisen because of it. These have included laws for the benefit of refugees, laws granting nonquota status to preference immigrants on oversubscribed quotas and innumerable private relief bills. It is time we stopped trying to heal the patient with temporary palliatives and performed the radical surgery that is necessary to correct the basic cause of his illness.

The reported bill would accomplish this purpose by abolishing the national origins quota system and replacing it with a new system of immigration selection. This new system will not only extend the principles of fairness and equality to prospective immigrants. It will also improve the overall quality of the immi-

August 24, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

20799

grants admitted and it will do so without increasing the volume of immigration disproportionately.

In answer to the arguments that have been raised against other current immigration bills from the standpoint of their effect on the labor market of the country, the reported bill contains new safeguards to protect the domestic worker from job competition and from adverse working conditions as a result of the immigration of foreign workers. If administered correctly these new safeguards will offer the American worker more protection against immigrant workers than he now enjoys.

The bill can have only one effect: improvement in our immigration system by eliminating from the law provisions which do not reflect the true traditions and ideals of this country and which have not in fact operated to control our immigration policy as they were intended to do. It is clear to me, therefore, that the bill should be adopted.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2580.

Laws—

Clarence Darrow once said—
should be like clothes. They should be made to fit the people they are meant to serve.

Our current immigration laws do not fit either Darrow's definition or the needs of our society or the desires and hopes of those who look to our shores for a bright future. They fit in with little but the xenophobic fears and hypocritical sentiments of those who would close our doors to all but those with acceptable credentials. They mirrored the narrow views of those who cried, "America for Americans," and forgot that they too were descendants of immigrants.

In 1924 our immigration policy became discriminatory, and exclusive entry became based on a system designed to maintain the ethnic balance of the American population as it existed in 1920. This national origins system has been preserved in all its injustice up to the present time.

It has become evident that our immigration policy is unpalatable to our people. Its ineffectiveness clearly demonstrates that.

While the law fixes an annual immigration ceiling of 158,000, the actual number of people admitted annually is almost twice as high.

This difference is traceable to two sources: the nonquota Western Hemisphere immigrants and the thousands who obtain entrance through the private bills that pass Congress every year and override the law's limitations.

What we are trying to achieve now is not only a quality of fairness and justice in our laws and their application; we are also trying to eliminate a dead letter from the statute books so that we may exert effective and temperate control and establish a semblance of order in regard to

the highly important matter of immigration.

The time has passed when we can freely open our gates to all who may wish to enter. The pressures of population growth alone would make this unfeasible. Yet, it is never too late for us to reestablish admission policies based on sensible priorities and reasonable qualifications. There is no longer room for a wide-open gateway into the United States—there are no virgin lands to settle and few occupations which are in dire need of labor. Yet, there still is room for those in need of shelter and those in search of freedom. And there is still need for those with skills and talents.

The proposed immigration legislation recognizes these standards and these needs while it eliminates arbitrary differentiations which belie the principles on which the United States was founded.

Specifically, the major provisions of the amended legislation would accomplish these things:

First, It would repeal the national origins quota system, effective July 1, 1968.

As most of us know, the national origins quota system has produced a deplorable situation. Some countries—mostly in northern and western Europe—have large quotas which they hardly come close to filling, while other nations are limited to 100 immigrants and have waiting lists of thousands. Some prospective immigrants, in Japan and Turkey for example, face waiting periods of up to 322 years under present regulations. This certainly indicates more hope than commonsense.

Until now, these surplus quotas have not been transferable. During the 3-year transition period from national origins quotas, the surplus would be transferred to an immigration pool to offset the unevenness of availability of visas under the old law.

Second, It would repeal, effective immediately, the last vestiges of the Asia-Pacific triangle concept.

The Asia-Pacific triangle stands out as grossly discriminatory even within the overall discriminatory legislation. It limits immigration on the basis of racial ancestry from the vast areas of the Far East. This effectively means that most Far Eastern nations with their huge populations have annual U.S. immigration quotas of 100. Immediate repeal will put Asia-Pacific triangle applicants on equal footing with others who would immigrate to the United States.

Third, New criteria for immigration would replace the national origins quota system, and substitute preference categories with a ceiling limitation of 20,000 immigrants from any 1 country. Total immigration for any 1 year would be 170,000, exclusive of Western Hemisphere and immediate family member immigration.

The preference categories stress fam-

ily unity as their utmost aim. Under these categories, first preference goes to unmarried children of U.S. citizens; second preference, to spouses and children of aliens with permanent residence in the United States; third, to professionals, scientists, and artists; fourth and fifth, to married children and brothers and sisters, respectively, of U.S. citizens; sixth, to those persons—skilled or unskilled—capable of filling labor shortages; and last, to refugees from Communist domination or political persecution.

It is certain that many gross inconsistencies would be eliminated by this new policy. Perhaps no more will we hear such painful case histories as the one of the naturalized Italian who could import an Irish maid in no time but would have to wait years to bring his mother from Italy.

Total immigration will not increase substantially under the newly proposed policy, but it will be more fairly apportioned. No longer will it impose on hopeful citizens the hard choice between citizenship and family unity. No longer will it perpetuate a bigotry and injustice that harms us in the eyes and hearts of the world. No longer will it make a travesty of our laws by making hundreds of thousands seek devious doorway into the United States which bypass our antiquated laws.

We have been waiting patiently for a very long time for an enlightened immigration policy. President Johnson thinks we have found it in the current legislation, which he has called "a breakthrough for reason, a triumph for justice." Let it not die before enactment, as have all its predecessors, for the patience of many good Americans is wearing thin and the good will of many of our brother nations is waning.

The time for change and the opportunity for improvement has arrived. Let us not ignore it, nor those many worthy immigrants who would make their homes among us. We can offer a warm hand—instead of a cold shoulder. Let us make that change now.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their re-

20800

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 24, 1965

marks in the body of the Record during general debate on H.R. 2580, and that Members who have spoken may have permission to revise and extend their remarks, and include certain extraneous material and tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

REPORT OF LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES OF HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Mr. McMILLAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I notice that a great many Members may have got their orders and are lined up to sign the petition to discharge the Committee on the District of Columbia from its duties. My committee is in the middle of hearings on the home rule bill at the present time and we of course want to hear everyone that can shed any light on this controversial subject. Under permission already granted, I shall include a résumé of the work of the District Committee for the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, there is one thing which I would like to explain while I am on my feet and that is the fact that almost every press report states there have been six bills which have passed the Senate and referred to the House District Committee without any action having been taken on them.

Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to correct this impression or error through the press and otherwise, but for some reason or other they will not print it.

Mr. Speaker, the House District Committee, during the time I was serving as ranking Democrat, reported a similar bill to the one that is on the Speaker's desk at the present time to the floor of the House in 1948. The House spent 3 days debating this bill and the bill was then sent back to the committee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that action alone indicates my committee has not been derelict in its duties. I believe we have held five different sets of hearings on home rule proposals and just because a majority of the 25-member committee are of the opinion that this is not good legislation and during previous years refused to vote it from the committee, I do not think is any reason why any Member should sign that petition discharging the committee from further consideration of this legislation, if we are to continue to have a committee procedure in handling bills on Capitol Hill.

Reckless and unfounded statements have appeared in the press from time to time, charging the Congress with a lack

of proper concern for the fiscal well-being of the District of Columbia. I wish to submit the six exhibits attached hereto for the Record, for the purpose of showing the degree to which the Congress has discharged its fiscal responsibility toward the District of Columbia, in acceptance of the Federal Government's stewardship over the Nation's Capital as spelled out in section 8 of article I of the Constitution. The facts revealed in these exhibits will serve to place these accusations in their proper light.

Exhibit No. 1 lists the expenditures of Federal funds in the District of Columbia, exclusive of the annual Federal contributions to the D.C. General Fund and to the city's water and sewer funds, for fiscal years 1964 and 1965. This compilation reveals that such expenditures reached a total in excess of \$176 million in fiscal year 1965; further, while some of these payments are similar in nature to grants made to the various States, more than \$72 million of this total was spent on programs and projects which are not duplicated in any other jurisdiction. When this amount is added to the \$40 million appropriated in 1965 to the District of Columbia funds mentioned above, certainly there can be no justification for any allegation of "neglect" on the part of the Congress.

Exhibit No. 2 is a presentation of expenditures in the District in certain major categories directly affecting the public welfare, with an indication also of the relative rank of the District of Columbia with respect to these expenditures in comparison with the other U.S. cities of comparable size. These figures show the Nation's Capital to rank first among these cities in per capita expenditures in three of the six categories, and second, third, and fourth respectively in the three others.

Exhibit No. 3 shows, in detail, the expenditures for personal services in each of the 17 U.S. cities referred to above, in fiscal years 1951 and in 1963, together with the increase in this expenditure in each city during this interval of 12 years. These figures show the District to rank first among these cities in this expenditure by a very large margin, and highest by far also in the increase in this expenditure. This latter figure is highly significant, for while it is true that the District of Columbia, because of its peculiar status as the Federal City, has certain functions and responsibilities which are assumed elsewhere by the State governments and which would account for a higher expenditure for personal services in the District than in these other cities, it is true also that Washington has always had these extra responsibilities. They have not increased in number, and thus this fact does not account in anyway for the great increase in such expenditure over a pe-

riod of years. All salaried positions in the District of Columbia Government must be authorized, and the salaries appropriated, by congressional action. Thus, little justification may be found in these facts for any implication of "stinginess" on the part of the Congress.

Exhibit No. 4 presents some further detail in two vital areas, showing the amounts appropriated in fiscal years 1961 through 1965 for Public Education and for Public Welfare in the District of Columbia. These figures are of particular interest in light of the statistics in exhibit No. 2 which show the District to rank second and fourth, respectively, in these two categories among the 17 comparable U.S. cities. In connection with expenditures for public welfare, of course, it should be borne in mind that the District of Columbia has the highest per capita income and normally the lowest rate of unemployment among all these cities.

Exhibits Nos. 5 and 6 pertain to the District of Columbia public school system, the area in which the Congress has been subjected to the greatest amount of unfounded criticism. An item in exhibit No. 2 indicates that the District of Columbia ranked second, in 1963, among the 17 comparable U.S. cities with respect to operating expenditures per pupil in average daily membership. Exhibit No. 5 presents this picture in detail, showing the actual amount of this highly significant expenditure in each of these cities during school year 1962-63, and also for school year 1956-57. These figures show that the District rose from sixth to second place in this expenditure during this period of 6 years, and ranked first among these cities in the increase in this figure. These statistics, together with the item of \$75 million spent in the past decade for new school construction, completely belies the frequent allegation that Congress is in any way indifferent to the quality of public education in the Nation's Capital. Exhibit No. 6 shows in detail the incredible cost of broken window panes in the District of Columbia schools, which has exceeded three-quarters of a million dollars over the past 10 years.

It should be pointed out that in these exhibits, fiscal year 1963 is the most recent year for which the figures involving the 17 U.S. cities of populations comparable to the District's are presently available.

These exhibits, taken as a whole, certainly paint a picture which utterly belies any statement alleging that the Congress has in any way neglected its responsibility toward the District.

The District of Columbia belongs to all the citizens of this country, and a generous share of their tax money has consistently been appropriated toward the proper support of their Capital City.

July 7, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3599

Now It's There; Now It Isn't

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, over the past weeks a familiar pattern regarding reports on phases of the so-called war on poverty has developed. First, someone who has been close to an individual project will point out problems in its operations or administration. The next day, a high official of the Office of Economic Opportunity will deny that any such problems exist. It is a kind of "now it's there, now it isn't" game.

Last week, a high official of the NAACP said the programs were not reaching the poor. The next day a high official of the OEO said they were.

This week, the Women's Job Corps Training Center at St. Petersburg, Fla., provides the playing field. It is housed in a former luxury hotel, which the Director of the Women's Job Corps says isn't luxurious.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following two newspaper reports. The first is from the Washington Daily News of July 6. The second is from the Washington Post of July 7.

[From the Washington Daily News, July 6, 1965]

INSIDE LOOK AT ANTIPOVERTY PROJECT—
TRAINING CENTER: "A COUNTRY CLUB"

(By Ken Schlossberg)

A young Washington woman who quit her staff job at the first Women's Job Corps Training Center in St. Petersburg, Fla., said today the place is being "run like a country club."

Gloria Pasternak, 25, of 4501 29th Street NW., who was a counselor in residence, said the staff has lots of money but little experience. So the young girls brought there for job training are getting instead a paid vacation at the beach.

"Everything is given, given, given to them," she said. "They aren't allowed to do a thing for themselves."

RESORT

The center, opened in April, is in an oceanside hotel in a resort area. Some 125 girls, aged from 16 to 21, are living there now.

Here's a list of what the girls are getting: Thirty dollars spending money a month and \$50 in the bank (in addition, of course, to room and board.)

One hundred dollars worth of clothing. Four maids and 16 kitchen employees to do the housework for them.

A shuttle bus to take them to classes (only a few blocks away), to the beach, and on trips around town.

"The one thing that wasn't given them was a staff that could help them and cared enough to try," Miss Pasternak said.

TROUBLES

Actually, in the weeks since Miss Pasternak quit, the center's difficulties have mushroomed.

Its director, Joseph Ems, quit.

The Pinellas County School Board said it wanted out of an 18-month \$2,461,907 contract with the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity to run the center.

The St. Petersburg City Council asked that the center be moved after people complained of excessive noise and rowdiness.

OEO officials admitted it was a mistake to put the center in the hotel.

BETTER

"The Huntington Hotel was already plush—but it's more so after some of our own improvements," Miss Pasternak said.

The improvements included a new kitchen, new air conditioning and fire alarm systems, and new furnishings.

"Though the hotel is leased for \$12,500 a month—\$225,000 over the life of the contract—the owner has not had to carry any of the improvement costs," she said.

Few of the persons running the center had experience with young girls.

Mr. Ems, a former county welfare director, recently admitted his experience with young people is very limited.

Miss Betty J. Gardiner, a former employee of the county health department and now assistant director of the center, has always been an administrator.

James Northrop, head residence counselor, came from an administrative position in a Federal manpower training program.

"The only person qualified to handle young people was a man they have made a logistics supervisor," Miss Pasternak said. "That meant he was the man in charge of ordering \$40 desks for every girl."

GONE

He is Darrell Blackburn, a former juvenile court probation officer. He has now resigned. He said he couldn't "stand the waste of money going on."

Miss Pasternak said: "Basic education courses for the girls are good, but the vocational courses were limited, at one point, to typing. And no homework is ever assigned."

As a result the girls have nothing to do and become bored.

SERVICE

"The maids clean their rooms, sweep the floors and empty the ashtrays," she said. "The kitchen help prepares the food, sets the table and washes the dishes."

"You would think the girls would be organized to keep the place neat and clean, to help out behind the food counter, to fold napkins. The ones that could type weren't even allowed to do clerical work."

She said boredom has allowed petty differences, some racially based, to blow up out of all proportion. The 125 girls were about evenly divided between white and Negro.

"We had some nasty fights," she said. "If the girls had been kept busy it wouldn't have happened."

INDIFFERENCE

She said staff indifference often aggravated other small problems.

"I remember one girl who wanted to change roommates and had good reasons," she said. "She made her request and nothing happened. Finally, she became so upset she left the center."

She said other girls would leave, seemingly without any warning.

"They always had reasons but we wouldn't find out until they were gone," she said. "There were no staff meetings to discuss the girls, to pinpoint their problems and try to help them."

By the time Miss Pasternak quit, some 20 girls had left—a few were emotionally unstable, some were just homesick. These were the girls the center could, and should, have done the most for, she said.

PRAISE

In general she thought highly of the young trainees.

"They are very fine, willing, alert," she said. "In fact, they were of a much higher caliber than I expected."

She said that when the girls first arrived most were serious and intent on taking advantage of the opportunity to learn. Then the atmosphere of largesse and permissiveness affected them.

"When a girl wants to study nursing and she's told to go out and play softball, it bothers her," said Miss Pasternak. "I heard one girl say, 'I didn't come down here for a party, but now I might as well have one.'"

Miss Pasternak said she expects the center to have more problems before it is straightened out.

"It's a mess and before it is over, it will be an even bigger mess," she said. "It's ironic, isn't it? With all the money that's being spent, the girls are still being short-changed."

SAYS DR. WASHINGTON: JOB CORPS NO LUXURY LIFE

(By Elizabeth Shelton)

Dr. Bennetta B. Washington, Director of Women's Job Corps Training Centers, denied yesterday that enrollees are enjoying country club living in a former luxury hotel in St. Petersburg, Fla.

"The hotel is not a luxurious kind of building," Dr. Washington said of the former Huntington Hotel, built in 1903. "It has four elevators that don't work. The kitchen had to be remodeled. There is air conditioning only in certain offices on the first floor. The girls sleep three and four to a room."

She was being questioned over WRC-TV (channel 4) by commentator Charles Murphy as to whether the enrollees are being coddled, as charged earlier yesterday by a former staff member.

Gloria Pasternak, 25-year-old resident adviser at the Florida center until June 1, and now vacationing on Long Island, charged, according to the Washington Daily News in a story later condensed and circulated by United Press International, that the center is being run more like a resort than a school.

Miss Pasternak told the Washington Post she regards the hotel as neither "plush" or "luxurious." The point she was trying to make, she said, was that having too many things given to them is destroying the girls' incentive.

Her private nickname for the old hotel during the 2 months she was there, she said, was "Termite Terrace."

Miss Pasternak, who worked on a kibbutz in Israel after graduating from college a year ago, said she thought the Government was not wasting, but was misusing, money in St. Petersburg.

What she questioned were the purchases of "wall-to-wall carpeting, expensive desks, golf clubs, and tennis rackets." She said her experience at the center "shattered my ideals of social work."

In her letter of resignation, Miss Pasternak quoted Oscar Wilde to the effect that she could no longer "follow the pack." She later had a conference with the director and then went to the press to air her views.

In St. Petersburg, a center spokesman said that Miss Pasternak "was trying to run things her way."

As explained by Dr. Washington following the television program, the Office of Economic Opportunity's concept is to free the young women for vocational training.

Dr. Washington said the center's 16 food service workers feed the young women 7,000-plus meals a week. Four maids are responsible for the upkeep of the lobby and hallways. The girls change their own linen and make their own beds, as well as tidying up their rooms.

Answering Miss Pasternak's complaint that the young women are not learning the salable job skills they came to acquire, Dr.

A3600

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 7, 1965

Washington said they have a full schedule of basic education and vocational training.

At least a dozen are in on-the-job training in food preparation and service, and another dozen are learning recreation direction on the job. Others are doing clerical work.

She pointed out that the center had not reached its full complement of enrollees when Miss Pasternak left. There are now 242 girls. A total of 27 have left, mainly due to homesickness or illness in the family.

Six girls were disciplined by Assistant Director Betty Gardiner over the holiday weekend, Dr. Washington said, adding that two are still at the center with status pending.

She said the girls were disciplined for disruptive behavior, not for drinking charges alone. Miss Gardiner told the Washington Post that the other girls applauded when she told them disciplinary action was taking place.

Dr. Washington also said that the St. Petersburg City Council has not yet informed the OEO of its action last week. By a 6-to-1 vote, with Mayor Herman Goldner dissenting, the council voted to request removal of the center from that city "as soon as possible."

She added that Project Officer June Henry, a former Air Force logistics officer, has returned to St. Petersburg to make an objective study of the situation. Dr. Washington said it is a little too early for her to evaluate whether the site is wrong.

She observed that St. Petersburg wanted the center and made an attractive proposal in order to get it there.

Last week she added, Assistant Superintendent Joseph D. Mills came to Washington to assure the OEO that the Pinellas County Board of Public Instruction intends to fulfill its contract.

The board selected the site and the staff, Dr. Washington said. The program has now been in operation 3 months. It has recently come under heavy criticism from residents who complain of the rowdiness of their youth hanging around the girls' hotel. Last week, after city council action, Joseph R. Ems, former county welfare director, handed in his resignation.

The school board will act on the resignation at a July meeting.

Another Myth Dispelled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I place in the Record an editorial from the Chicago Daily News of June 29 which is as practical a commentary as I have seen on the recent change of government in Algeria:

ANOTHER MYTH DISPELLED

The delay of the long-touted Afro-Asian conference in Algiers is being hailed as a diplomatic defeat for Red China, which is doubtless true. China had become the principal promoter of the "second Bandung" conference and viewed it as a springboard for assuming a leadership role second to none in the world.

The Chinese plan even included blocking Russia from admission to the conference on the ground that Russia is a European power despite all that stretch of the Soviet Union across Asia to the Pacific. Under the banner of Afro-Asian unity—which in the Chinese plan carries a broad stripe of anti-

white racism—there was to be a huge propaganda campaign against the United States and white "imperialists" in general.

The postponement of the conference wrecked these plans, but Red China's was not the only defeat. The principal casualty was the concept of Afro-Asian unity itself, which had been promoted by other self-seeking nations besides China. The nations of Asia and Africa, many of them still so new they scarcely deserve to be called nations, are nowhere near ready for unity, behind China or anyone else.

Among the countries invited to the conference were some that stand firmly with the United States, like Japan, Thailand, and the Philippines. Others, like India, are striving to remain unattached. Many of the new African nations retain strong ties with Britain or France.

The revolution in Algeria which unseated Ahmed Ben Bella proved convenient for some diplomats who clearly had misgivings about the conference to begin with. The postponement to November, when it came, was in a sense belated recognition that the conference had failed before it started.

The immediate gainer from this fiasco may be the United States, which at least was spared the embarrassment of fiery castigation from Red China about the situation in Vietnam. Russia, too, comes out ahead for the time being.

But the long-range gainers are surely the Afro-Asian nations themselves, who need no longer subscribe to the myth that geography binds them inevitably into a chain in which Red China is the largest link.

Bill Miller
The Immigration Bill—Sensible and Humane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, a major item of unfinished business for the 89th Congress is the Celler immigration bill now pending before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration.

The principal reform called for in the Celler bill and my companion bill, H.R. 2856, is the elimination of the national-origins quota system over a 5-year period. Over the years, Congress has recognized the injustice caused by the present system and has enacted special legislation and private bills to remedy specific cases. The proposed bill would substantially reduce the number of private immigration bills introduced each year for the relief of individuals. By way of example, in the last four Congresses 14,672 such bills were introduced and 2,155 were enacted.

It should be emphasized that there is no relaxing of the qualitative criteria for admissibility to the United States and that no relaxation of these mental, moral, economic, and ideological criteria is proposed by this legislation. Under the proposed amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act preferences will be granted to those whose skills are especially advantageous to the United States and to relatives of U.S. citizens and resident aliens to promote the reuniting of families. Under this

legislation, the total number of persons to be admitted to this country would not be substantially increased.

I commend to my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the July 6, 1965, edition of Newsday, published in Nassau County, N.Y.:

ACTION ON IMMIGRATION

It is fitting that Congress, at Independence Day weekend, is on the verge of giving a significant boost to President Johnson's proposals for a sweeping revision of the Nation's archaic and discriminatory immigration laws. America has been made great not only through the labor and dedication of our native born citizens, but also as a result of the great contribution that has been made by the millions of immigrants.

But while millions have come, millions more have been denied entrance to the United States under iniquitous immigration statutes dating back to 1924 which base the selection of whom shall be admitted on a national origins quota system. This formula has tended to favor the countries of Western Europe (where the demand to emigrate has fallen off) and discriminate against the nations of south and central Europe (where the demand has increased tremendously).

Under the administration bill about to be reported out of the House Judiciary Subcommittee, the country-by-country quota formula would be abolished in favor of a system which would base preference on work and cultural skills, and the reuniting of separated families. Despite the change, the number of those permitted to enter the country would not be substantially enlarged. The proposed new law is sensible and humane. It deserves early passage by the Congress.

I commend Newsday for treating editorially a subject about which the citizens of the Fifth Congressional District are in large numbers writing to their Congressman.

Dear Graduate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, during the past month, the thoughts of many of us have been on the thousands upon thousands of men and women who are graduating from high school. These thoughts, naturally, relate to the long hours and years of devotion in educating these students to face the grave responsibilities of their generation.

The Reverend Joe Ferreira attended the graduation exercises at the San Leandro High School in my congressional district in San Leandro, Calif. During the period of the ceremony, he had time to reflect on the 4 years between the entering class and the graduating class, and to put into writing his advice to these particular graduates. Because I believe his words are so appropriate and should be shared by many others, and not only the graduates of San Leandro High School, I am pleased to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Father Ferreira's message, which appears in the San Leandro Morning News of June 25, 1965:

July 6, 1965

nomic blueprint. The group meets under the chairmanship of Otto Eckstein, a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, and includes top officials of the Budget Bureau, the Treasury, Commerce and Labor Departments and the Federal Reserve Board.

While a preliminary draft of the group's findings is being circulated among ranking administration aids, a final report will be prepared only after the technical experts receive newly revised national output figures that are due to become available later this summer.

The administration blueprint shows that the Government will have to give the economy a helping hand by cutting taxes, boosting spending—or both—to keep the economic upturn from sagging.

The growth committee expects the potential budget surplus to climb above \$10 billion by 1970. It believes that a multi-billion-dollar fiscal drain of this magnitude would brake the economy's advance.

The administration group's final report will suggest a variety of tax and spending steps that the President can take to offset the expected budget drag.

President Johnson has committed himself to giving a tax break to the lowest income groups when he next proposes a tax reduction—possibly in 1966—but it is expected that there will be at least one more general tax reduction before 1970.

Walter Heller, former Council of Economic Advisers chairman, called these repeated cuts "fiscal dividends." His theory, which now is administration policy, is that the cuts are made possible by the mounting tax receipts from a growing economy and are essential to keep the Government from building up repressive budget surpluses.

Last year's \$11.6 billion tax cut was a historic first application of the fiscal-drag approach. This year's \$4.7 billion excise cut is a followup move in the same direction.

The growth committee blueprint is even more of a target for the administration than a forecast of what is certain to be achieved.

The Council of Economic Advisers accurately predicted last year's \$623 billion national output volume, and the economy is expected to come very close to hitting a CEA forecast of \$600 billion for this year. But a 1970 or 1975 blueprint is far more uncertain and difficult.

The 4-percent unemployment rate that the Interagency Committee expects to achieve in 1967 is the Kennedy-Johnson administration's interim full employment goal. Unemployment averaged 4.6 percent last month, the lowest that it has been since 1957.

The group believes that it will be possible to achieve a 3-percent unemployment rate by 1968. It has pinpointed teenagers and adult Negro women as the two critical groups and has concluded that it will be necessary to slash unemployment for each of these to 5 percent to achieve a 3-percent national average for all members of the working force.

The blueprint is an elaborate, enormously detailed document that contains estimates of the amounts that will be spent each year for factories and homes, for machinery and appliances, for roads and food, for automobiles, vacations, medical care and all other significant business and consumer purposes.

It contains an exhaustive breakdown of expected school outlays by local governments—right down to the number of desks that will be required. It also examines other major types of State and local government spending, such as for hospitals, sewers, water, and police and fire protection.

While no new Federal programs are included, the blueprint projects all of the Government programs that now either are underway or have been requested by the President. The education bill is included, so are the poverty program, Appalachia, and medicare.

THE MONUMENTAL MISTAKES OF THE RUSSIAN FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, those who oppose the U.S. program of foreign aid have made much of the mistakes and foulups which have occurred in the past. To many, the American personnel administering the program abroad are, indeed, "ugly Americans." But now we have an opposite force to balance against this picture. Victor Lasky has written a book called "The Ugly Russian," in which he documents the monumental mistakes of the Russian foreign aid program; and Roscoe Drummond, in his column this week, has taken off from there, to repeat some of Mr. Lasky's examples of Soviet ineptitude, leading to the conclusion that the Russians will, as we have done, learn from their mistakes, and do better. We are doing better, as a matter of fact, Mr. President; and I second Roscoe Drummond's point that Mr. Lasky's report "should give us every incentive to do better, not to quit—because the balance sheet is on our side."

I ask unanimous consent that the Drummond article from the Washington Post be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REPORT ON RED AID: "THE UGLY RUSSIAN" A TIMELY BOOK

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Have you ever wondered just how well—or badly—the Soviet foreign aid program is doing and whether it is really making friends and carrying communism to the underdeveloped nations?

This is a good question to have come up at the moment when Congress is about to decide whether to cut U.S. foreign aid funds on the theory that the American program is badly run and is not doing much good.

"The Ugly American" became a bestseller and had a great impact on American thinking. It was a certainty that its counterpart would be written and logically, almost inevitably, be called "The Ugly Russian" (Trident Press).

It has been—by Victor Lasky, the newspaperman and author who set out to get some facts at firsthand.

Maybe too many Americans—and others—think that Russian foreign aid is brilliantly administered, coolly efficient, getting a lot of political dividends at little cost, and outsmarting us at every turn.

If many of us have been tempted to think so, then Lasky offers us a timely and useful dissent. He finds a whole series of monumental foulups in Soviet foreign aid and concludes that neither Moscow nor Peking is making significant headway in trying to plant communism in the African and Asian nations.

"The Ugly Russian" is not a superheated attack on Russia or Russians. It is a report on the trials and tribulations, the frustrations, and the fiascos of Communist foreign aid operations, principally Russian.

Are they beating us at every turn? Are they doing so well that Congress might as well decide the United States should give up? Or are the Communist failures so widespread that now is the time for us to press on more energetically?

Lasky went to India, Asia, Africa and the Middle East to find out.

What he found out was that the Communists are doing badly often enough to be

losing more friends than they are making. He found such things as the following:

Bad planning. Equatorial and undeveloped Guinea was the "beneficiary" of two giant snowplows from Russia, and from East Germany, one million equally unwanted screwdrivers, one for every three citizens. There are many more such examples.

Bad execution. Without warning, Russia shipped to Burma 50,000 tons of cement. Before it could be removed from the wharves, it hardened into unbreakable concrete and had to be dumped into the bay. Did the Soviets learn the lesson? Later they did the same thing in Guinea, Ghana, and twice in the Sudan.

Bad orchestration. At the very moment that Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev was speaking honeyed words to the Iranian Parliament, a Soviet jet fighter shot down an unarmed Iranian plane 18 miles inside the Iranian border.

Bad relations. After studying in Moscow, an African student reported for himself and colleagues: "We have been called back monkeys and jungle people and treated like dirt. Whoever among us had leftist leanings has been cured." African students have left Red China avowing the same experience. The Chinese brand the Soviets as racist and the Soviets brand the Chinese as racist. Soviet ambassadors were ejected from the Congo and from Guinea.

These and other similar incidents do not mean that everything has gone wrong in Communist aid. It hasn't. These things do not mean that the Soviet Union is not a vastly formidable force or that the Communist can be dismissed as played out. They'll keep at it and learn from their mistakes.

But we need to keep at it, too. Obviously the badly conceived and sometimes badly executed Communist aid programs do not prove that our own aid program cannot be improved. Lasky's report should give us every incentive to do better, not to quit—because the balance sheet is on our side.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S IMMIGRATION PROPOSALS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, at a meeting on June 24, 1965, the Common Council of the City of New Britain adopted a resolution urging the Connecticut congressional delegation to support President Johnson on his immigration proposals.

I am one of the cosponsors of the immigration liberalization bill recommended to Congress by the President. And I wish to assure the common council and the many other people in my State who support the long overdue reform of our immigration statutes that I will work to obtain approval of this measure, S. 500, at an early date.

On the same subject, Mr. President, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a statement presented to the House Subcommittee on Immigration.

It was made by Mr. John Ottaviano, supreme venerable of the Order Sons of Italy in America, and is an expression of strong support for the administration immigration recommendations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the New Britain Common Council's resolution and the statement of the Order Sons of Italy in America printed at this point in the Record.

15016

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 6, 1965

There being no objection, the resolution and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF NEW BRITAIN

Whereas President Johnson proposed a new immigration law to Congress on January 13 and described it as legislation long overdue; and

Whereas our President advocates immigration on a first come, first served basis within the following established categories:

1. Preference is reserved for immigrants whose exceptional skills are in short supply and which are advantageous to the United States.

2. Preference is reserved for sons and daughters over 21 years of age of U.S. citizens.

3. Preference is reserved to spouses and unmarried children of aliens permanently residing in the United States.

4. Preference is reserved for married sons and daughters of U.S. citizens, brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens, parents of aliens and workers with lesser skills who might be needed to fill specific needs; and

Whereas there are many peoples in New Britain of all nationalities vitally interested in this legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of New Britain go on record favoring this legislation and that all Connecticut Senators and Congressmen be sent copies of this resolution urging them to support President Johnson on his immigration proposals.

STATEMENT OF THE ORDER SONS OF ITALY IN AMERICA ON IMMIGRATION TO THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION

The Order Sons of Italy in America is a fraternal organization which this year celebrates its diamond jubilee. It was founded in 1905 in New York State and has expanded during the years of its continuous existence so that its members today reside in 27 States and the District of Columbia.

During the 60 years of its existence, the order has been keenly interested in and has spoken from time to time on matters involving the immigration policies of our country.

First we should like to present to this honorable subcommittee a brief insight into the nature of our order and the beliefs of its membership by setting forth the preamble to our constitution which we believe clearly and forcefully states our purposes, beliefs, and aspirations:

"We, the members of the Order Sons of Italy in America, a fraternal organization, being a part of the United States of America which we serve at all times with undivided devotion, and to whose progress we dedicate ourselves; united in the belief in God; conscious of being a representative element of an old civilization which has contributed to the enlightenment of the human spirit, and which through our activities, institutions and customs may enrich and broaden the pattern of the American way of life; realizing that through an intelligent and constant exercise of civic duties and rights and obedience to the Constitution of the United States, we uphold and strengthen this Republic; in order to make known our objectives and insure their attainment through the harmonious functioning of all parts of our organization, the said Order Sons of Italy in America do hereby ordain and establish the following as our constitution * * *"

It is therefore, we believe, as a truly American organization, devoted and dedicated entirely to the support of our beloved United States and seeking only to enhance its image, its influence and prestige with the other nations of this world that we today express our views on this very vital question of immigration.

We appeared last year before your honorable subcommittee and we were most pleased and happy with the cordial reception and the fine opportunity afforded us to

present the views of the order in our statement and in the question and answer period that followed. We might also add that these sentiments were conveyed to our membership throughout the country and in the two Provinces of Quebec and Ontario via our national newspaper, OSIA News.

Frankly, we must also in good faith and complete honesty and sincerity express to you and through you to the entire House Judiciary Committee and ultimately to the House of Representatives itself the very keen disappointment shared by the entire membership over the failure to take action last year on this most vital field of action.

The eyes of the friendly nations of the world are on the United States in these crucial days and months and years when they are crying for enlightened leadership. They eagerly look first to America, the land of the free and the home of the brave and that has provided a sanctuary for thousands of people, displaced by war, oppressed and persecuted by bigotry, prejudice, and injustice of the worst kind. These nations look for the signs, the acts, and the deeds which clearly and forcefully establish that America practices what it preaches.

The pages of our immigration history do not always make the most pleasant reading. All of us have been too prone to forget that the only native American was the American Indian. Although our land was peopled by the oppressed, we need to be urged that it is a duty and a privilege to offer a home to others who are oppressed.

Four Presidents of these United States have consistently urged the Congress to revise the immigration laws so that the changes when passed would bring American principles of justice and equality to our immigration laws.

The provisions of the current administration bills on immigration we believe to be fair and reasonable.

The admission of the immigrants would be based upon our needs, their need for asylum, their relationship to others already in the country, and finally their economic needs and their skills.

These should be the criteria for selecting our immigrants and not an arbitrary, meaningless, discriminatory, prejudicial and harmful national origins quota system.

President Johnson in his message indicated that action is long overdue for immigration reform. The order strongly concurs in this statement.

The President further stated: "The principal reform called for is the elimination of the national origins quota system. That system is incompatible with our basic American tradition." The order supports this statement and gives it top priority in this question of immigration improvement.

We believe it to be most regrettable that statements have been made in support of retention of the present quota system in which comparisons have been made regarding contributions made to this country by immigrants.

Last year the supreme venerable and the national deputy of the order together with the president and other officials of the United-Italian American Labor Council of New York were privileged to spend quite some time with President Johnson in the Cabinet Room of the White House. At that time in a prepared statement, the President said among other things the following:

"No European nation has enriched us more than Italy. Italy is in many respects the mother of us all. Western culture—in Europe and in this country—is deeply indebted to the great minds and great men of Italy.

"When I think of Italy, I always think of Columbus—and I remember what Emerson said, 'Every ship that comes to America got its chart from Columbus.'"

Again we have heard unkind remarks re-

lating to the assimilation into the American way of life of our immigrants. The remarks stating that those from certain areas having larger quota numbers were more readily assimilated than those with lower quota numbers and this justified the retention of the present quota system.

We of course cry out "shame on such blind thinking." However, rather than engage in the argument directly, we again revert to the President of these United States and his current message to the Congress in which he stated in part: "We have no right to disparage the ancestors of millions of our fellow Americans in this way." We say "amen" and might well point out that there are in excess of 22 million of such Americans, and who participate in every phase and facet of our national society and civilization from the laborer to the leader. Finally, we wholeheartedly endorse this portion of the President's message:

"The quota system has other grave defects. Too often it arbitrarily denies us immigrants who have outstanding and sorely needed talents and skills. I do not believe this is either good government or good sense."

The official position of the Order Sons of Italy in America traditionally has been to support and favor the interests of the United States of America before those of any other country. With this view in mind, we submit the following:

1. The order is not in sympathy with any proposal for an unlimited or freewheeling immigration policy that would threaten the security and welfare of the United States, including our national goals of attaining full employment, the maintenance and improvement of American labor standards, and the raising of the standard of living of all Americans.

2. Immigration regulations should permit complete reunification of family units without discrimination.

3. Careful standards of selection of newcomers should be maintained, that is to say, any person admitted to the United States would have to meet prescribed health, morals, and security requirements.

4. That immigrants should be regarded more carefully for the skills that they possess and their value to our national needs.

5. Priority of registration, or the principal of first come, first served should be a very important criterion. In this regard we also recognize the need for a limitation on all countries to insure equal opportunities for admission.

6. With respect to the above item 5, we urge the reallocation of unused quota numbers to oversubscribed countries after the preliminary limitation has been applied. This could well help with many thousands of persons already in the United States but whose families must wait for years and years because of oversubscribed quota numbers; and yet this anguish and torment could be alleviated by transferring the quotas of undersubscribed countries.

7. We are in accord with the gradual changeover in eliminating the national origins quota system.

8. There appears to be no serious threat to the labor market in this country under the new legislation if adopted.

9. In addition to the last four American Presidents, current changes being advocated have also been supported by our last four Secretaries of State and by our last four Attorneys General.

A new committee presently being formed and to be known as the National Committee for Immigration Reform in its statement of purpose sets forth the following:

"By discriminating among nations on the basis of birthplace, the national origins provision is detrimental to our international interests, breeds hatred and hostility towards the United States, blocks comity among nations, and is a hindrance to our Nation's policy of peace among nations, without serv-

July 6, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15017

ing any national need or serving any international purpose of the United States.

"The order therefore endorses the passage at this session of the Congress H.R. 2580 introduced by the Honorable EMMANUEL Celler, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and S. 500 introduced by Senator HART, of Michigan, and some 32 other Senators.

"The Order Sons of Italy in America will hold its Diamond Jubilee National Convention in Baltimore, Md. from August 25 to August 28, 1965. How wonderful, gentlemen, if we could announce to those assembled at the convention that the Congress had finally adopted a new and more enlightened and more humane and truly American immigration policy by the enactment of this new legislation.

"We do not ask for anything that is revolutionary. We do not suggest changes in the law that are unfair and unreasonable. This great Nation of ours has always believed in equal justice under law. As Americans we believe in equal opportunity based upon qualifications. We ask for justice for all people. We ask that all potential immigrants be granted equal opportunity to prove their qualifications to enter this country. We have established military and naval bases in many countries to protect our American way of life. We are maintaining numerous Peace Corps units throughout the world to help others who are unable to help themselves. We have established and maintained for many years an excellent student exchange program that has helped to create a better understanding among the nations of the earth. We make vast contributions to the U.N., to NATO, to SEATO and to other international organizations. We do these things and many others because we want to maintain world peace at any cost, making any sacrifice. But all these international activities will be nullified if we persist in continuing an immigration policy that should never have been born.

"On the one hand, throughout our international activities we endeavor to prove to the world that we are a good neighbor, but on the other hand throughout our immigration policies we say to millions of people in many nations, 'You are not fit to enter this country. We don't want you. Stay where you are.'

"On behalf of the entire membership of the Order Sons of Italy in America, we urgently submit to you gentlemen that this Congress should not again permit the opportunity to pass without enacting favorable legislation. We, therefore, ask that your subcommittee bring out a favorable report on H.R. 2580; and, further, to exert all of your energies to bring about the passage of remedial legislation in both Houses and transmittal of the same to the President where we know it will finally be signed and proclaimed into law to your everlasting credit and endearment in the hearts of the overwhelming majority of the American people and our friendly people of other nations."

We, the undersigned, speaking for ourselves personally, and for the membership we have the honor to represent, we thank you Mr. Chairman and membership of the subcommittee for this opportunity to appear before you to present our views.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN OTTAVIANO, JR., Esq.,

Supreme Venerable.

SAMUEL CULOTTA, Esq.,

National Deputy.

JOSEPH A. L. ERIGO, Esq.,

Chairman, National Committee on Immigration.

JOHN F. NAVE,

Chairman, New York Grand Lodge.

DR. NICHOLAS M. PETRUZZELLI,

Economist.

HON. VITO MARINO.

Supreme Trustee.

JULY 6: FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF MALAWI'S INDEPENDENCE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, today, July 6, marks the first anniversary of independence for the people of Malawi. As we join Malawi in celebrating this significant milestone in her history, I extend my congratulations to all the people of Malawi, on this important occasion.

Known as Nyasaland before gaining her independence, Malawi, with her lush green foliage, high mountains, and large lakes is one of the most beautiful nations in Africa. Bounded by Northern Rhodesia on the northwest, Tanzania on the northeast, and Mozambique on the south and southeast, her 37,000 square miles comprise a part of the Great Rift Valley. Of all her natural splendor, she is most famous for her 360-mile-long lake, Lake Nyasa, which the famous explorer-missionary, David Livingstone, discovered in 1859.

Besides her natural beauty, this country, with a population of about 4 million, is also well endowed with good agricultural land. Its major commercial crop is tea.

As an independent nation in the British Commonwealth, Malawi has a government patterned on the British system, with the Prime Minister as Head of Government, and a unicameral National Assembly, consisting of 53 elected members.

Surely Malawi should be proud of its independence, its democratic government, and its economic and social development. I am sure that I speak for the Senate when I say that we are proud to join the people of Malawi in celebrating their first anniversary, and we look forward to ever-strengthening ties of friendship and cooperation between our nations.

WATER SHORTAGE AND POLLUTION OF THE POTOMAC RIVER

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in the past few days, several of Washington's distinguished newspapers have published editorials concerning the Potomac River.

The Evening Star correctly called attention to the problem of the shrinking water supply in the Potomac River Basin. The seriousness of this problem cannot be overestimated. People need water to live; and they need it in a clear and pure condition—not polluted by industrial and municipal wastes and silt.

This June, the Potomac's flow at Chain Bridge reached an all-time low. If this trend continues, the Washington metropolitan area will be faced with the same water-shortage problems that already are facing upstream communities in the Cumberland area.

As the Washington Post pointed out, a good start has now been made in planning for the Potomac. Last Monday, I had the distinct pleasure of meeting with Secretary Udall and the Governors of the four Basin States, to discuss some of the important problems related to the Potomac.

The Post's editorial correctly pointed out that planning should be a continuing

process, and that all action should not be postponed pending the outcome of final plans.

All too often, planning becomes an excuse for inaction and delay. Fortunately, this is not the case with the current planning efforts. On the local, State, and Federal level of government, there is an awareness of the need for immediate action if solutions for the problems of the Potomac are going to be found.

I ask unanimous consent that these two fine editorials be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, June 30, 1965]

SHRINKING WATER SUPPLY

In some parts of the country rivers are on a flooding rampage. But the water shortage is critical in other areas—New York City, eastern New York and Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and southern New England.

The Potomac still furnishes ample water for Washington and those communities in the surrounding areas which draw upon it. But warning signals are flying.

The Potomac's flow at Chain Bridge is at an all-time low for June. Last September the daily flow was almost down to the 474 million gallons a day record low set in November 1930. Given another summer of drought this year, we could be close to the danger point by fall.

The Washington area water system is capable of providing 470 million gallons of Potomac water a day but it has never been called upon to deliver at capacity. The District system alone, with a capacity of 355 million, has never been called upon for more than 265 million gallons in 1 day. But the problem grows as the demands for water rise throughout the metropolitan area, for farm irrigation upstream, and for other purposes. Unless the rains are forthcoming, it is not at all inconceivable that the riverbed one day may be dry from Little Falls to tidewater. The need, not only here but throughout the East and Northeast, is for summer rainfall substantially and consistently above normal.

A helpful aspect is the effort now underway, led by Interior Secretary Udall, to make the Potomac Basin a model for the Nation. And this of course includes water conservation as well as beautification and preservation of points of historic interest. It is urgent in our opinion, that the efforts in this respect by the Federal Government and the participating State governments be carried forward vigorously and without unnecessary delay.

[From the Washington Post, July 1, 1965]

TO PROTECT THE POTOMAC

Anyone can draw up a plan for the development of the Potomac River. But drawing up a plan that will be enforced is altogether another matter. In the past, the planning for the river has begun with arguments among the technicians and ended with stalemate among the politicians. Secretary Udall now intends to begin with a political agreement, and work from there into the technicalities of river planning. The Secretary is showing a gift for learning from the ill success of others (in this case, the Army Engineers), and his meeting with the Governors of the States of the Potomac Basin symbolized the new beginning. As Governor Tawes of Maryland observed, it was the first time in the river's long history that the Federal and State authorities had jointly considered the future use, and present misuse, of the region's greatest natural resource.

15018

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 6, 1965

Mr. Udall was quite right to recognize that a sound plan cannot be prepared in the half-year of the original schedule; but he was equally right to point out that many of the most urgent decisions can be taken without waiting for the entire plan. This city has fallen into the evil habit of putting off all decisions pending plans that are never finished. Planning for the Potomac will be a continuous process, and the plan never will be finished. But very early in the process the planners can decide, for example, whether to build the Army Engineers' high dams. Happily, the men around Mr. Udall's table seemed heavily inclined against the high dams (the sole exception being Congressman MACHEN, who appeared to have missed the cardinal point that these dams have very little to do with water supply).

The next question will be the creation of the agency to carry out the planning. Mr. Udall spoke of the Delaware River Commission, in which the Federal Government sits as an equal partner of the States. Senator BREWSTER, of Maryland, spoke of expanding the present Interstate Commission on the Potomac. The suggestions both look toward a new kind of government, a regional authority that is both strong and responsive.

The foundation has now been laid for a genuinely cooperative development of the Potomac Basin. The essential element is a politically inspired plan, politically inspired in the true and useful sense of representing accurately the interests of the people who live here.

AMISTAD DAM AREA OFFERS VAST RECREATIONAL POTENTIAL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, recently I introduced a bill to establish a recreational area in the area of the Amistad Dam and Reservoir, now under construction on the border between Texas and Mexico.

The potential for recreation offered by this rough canyon country is tremendous, and has created much interest among all of those concerned with this project. To provide a description of the area involved and of the advantages of having a recreational area in this location, I ask unanimous consent that the headline article describing this bill, beginning on the front page and continuing on page 2 of the Del Rio News-Herald of June 22, 1965, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

YARBOROUGH INTRODUCES PARK BILL—EIGHT CONSTRUCTION SITES REQUESTED

Authorization for a national recreation area in the Amistad Reservoir area is sought in a bill introduced Monday in the U.S. Senate by Texas' senior Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH in Washington, D.C.

The bill YARBOROUGH introduced was prepared by the U.S. Interior Department at his request, and calls for the development of eight tracts in the reservoir area as a national recreation area, combining public outdoor recreation benefits with conservation of scenic and historic sites under the National Park Service.

"This bill offers a wonderful opportunity to establish a major recreation facility with national recognition," YARBOROUGH told the News-Herald in a telegram. "It will be a major attraction for tourists in the Southwest and will offer water sports second only to Padre Island National Seashore area, and for scenic beauty."

H. M. Pettit, chairman of Del Rio's Amistad

Dam Committee said Senator JOHN TOWER, Texas' junior Senator, has endorsed the bill and that Congressman O. C. FISHER of San Angelo, who represents the 21st Congressional District in which Amistad Dam is located, is introducing a similar bill in the U.S. House in Washington.

"I understand Senator YARBOROUGH and Senator TOWER are working together on this important measure," Pettit said, "and that Congressman FISHER introduced a similar bill in the House."

"This is something we've looked forward to for a long time since it is highly important not only to Del Rio but for the entire Southwest for this area to be developed for recreational facilities. The potential is already there; a little development promises almost unbounded possibilities," Pettit said.

Seven of the sites have been pinpointed and the eighth, Pettit said, will be at one of a number of tentative locations.

Two areas at the west end of Devil's River highway bridge and another at the east end, the end toward Del Rio, will be developed as recreational areas under the proposal submitted by Senator YARBOROUGH; another would be located in the San Pedro highway bridge vicinity; a fifth would be above Devil's Lake, around Rough Canyon; still another recreation area would be located at the Pecos River and a seventh site would be a fishing area below Amistad Dam, being built astride the Rio Grande 12 miles upstream from Del Rio and Ciudad Acuna, Mexico by the United States and Mexico.

"I think the eighth area would be a site somewhere in the lake area but the last I heard any discussion on it, a final selection had not been made," Pettit said.

Because of the rough canyon country in the reservoir area, deep inlets from the lake created by the dam will make scenic coves, Pettit pointed out, and will offer a contrast to the wide open areas of the lake where boating is expected to be a major recreation.

A long-time interest in the recreational aspects of Amistad Reservoir has been maintained by high Government officials, Pettit said, and U.S. Commissioner Joseph Friedkin of the International Boundary and Water Commission is one of the interested. Similar interest has been shown by his counterpart, Mexican Commissioner David Herrera Jordan of Juarez, Mexico.

Both men expressed an interest in such areas when they inspected the damsite recently when the model of the structure was unveiled at the I.B. & W.C. headquarters at Amistad village.

COMPENSATION FOR INNOCENT VICTIMS OF CRIMES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it is time that we in America started to give some consideration to the victims of crimes, rather than only to the perpetrators of these crimes. Right now, we provide to the indigent criminal free counsel. To the victim, however, we give nothing, even though we have failed to provide him the police protection which we have promised. I have introduced a bill—S. 2155—which at least provides for some actual compensation of losses incurred by the victims of violent crimes.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excellent article describing the bill. The article was written by Ned Curran, and was published in the June 21 edition of the Corpus Christi Caller-Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

YARBOROUGH SPONSORS BILL TO ASSIST CRIME VICTIMS

(By Ned Curran)

WASHINGTON.—Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH has begun a long trip through completely uncharted backwaters of criminal law with a bill to compensate the victims of violent crime.

In introducing the bill, YARBOROUGH told the Senate that society is given too much lately to lamenting the plight of the criminal.

"It is time," he said, "the Government of this Nation shows as much concern for the victims of crime of violence against the person as for the people who commit the crime."

The totally new concept embodied in the Senator's bill would apply, of necessity, only to Federal jurisdictions, such as the District of Columbia, military and Indian reservations, ships at sea and territories. He expressed the hope, however, that State and local jurisdictions study the idea with an eye toward emulating it.

The bill would establish a three-member Federal commission, appointed by the President and armed with quasi-judicial powers and a staff.

Any innocent victim of one of 14 crimes of violence, ranging from assault with intent to kill, rob, rape or prison to mayhem could file a claim with the commission within 2 years.

The commission, after establishing that the claimant was in fact the innocent victim of the crime, could then award compensation up to a limit of \$25,000.

YARBOROUGH has sought to plug as many loopholes as possible in the bill—there would be no appeal from the commission; attorney fees would be limited to 15 percent of an award over \$1,000; hospitalization or insurance benefits received by the victim would be taken into account; the prevailing commission guideline would be equity rather than legal technicalities; the victim cannot be related or married to the attacker; compensation would be limited to actual damages, shorn of any "profit" to the victim.

But obviously loopholes do and will crop up. One of YARBOROUGH's principal aims is to broach the idea and encourage discussion, debate and consideration. He admitted it may be 5 years before there is complete congressional acceptance of the concept.

He said although New Zealand and Great Britain have recently enacted similar laws, the matter is totally new to American jurisprudence. The only ally YARBOROUGH called up was Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg who has espoused the same idea.

"Since the middle of the 19th century," YARBOROUGH pointed out, "we have turned away from the old concepts of 'an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth,' and 'every man his best protector' as workable methods for punishing criminals and protecting the law-abiding citizens. We have demanded that people no longer go armed on our streets in order to protect themselves. We have outlawed vigilante groups. We have left the punishment of the criminal to the State rather than to the victim's relatives or a lynch-crazed mob."

"We have told our people," he continued, "that they will be best protected if law enforcement is left to the government, not to the private person. Having encouraged our people to go out into the streets unprotected, we cannot deny that this puts a special obligation upon us to see that these people are, in fact, protected from the consequences of crime."

YARBOROUGH contrasted the lot of the victim with the concern shown the criminal.

"What happens to the perpetrator of the brutal attack? Society says that, if apprehended, he must be warned of his legal rights to have an attorney before he is per-

CONFIDENTIAL

Journal - Office of Legislative Counsel
Tuesday - 22 June 1965

Page 3

25X1 8. [] Following a call from []
I talked with Miss Flanagan, in the office of Representative George Miller, in the Congressman's absence inquiring about two individuals recently returned from the Paris air show who had talked with Mr. Miller about the AM-22. I explained that Mr. Miller had thought we might like to interview these people and, consequently, asked her for exact names and where they could be reached. She said she would look into this and advise.

25X1 9. [] Delivered to Representative Jonathan Bingham an unclassified paper entitled "Communist Influence in Venezuela." It was requested that any use made of the information not be attributed to the Agency.

25X1 10. [] Met with Mrs. Fraser, in the office of Representative Herman Schneebeli, concerning the Congressman's request for an Agency seal. I advised her that none were none available at the moment. On the Congressman's behalf she thanked us very much for our response and indicated that at such time as one was available it would be most appreciated.

25X1 11. [] Met with Mr. James Cline, Staff Director of the House Immigration Subcommittee, concerning suggested new wording for an amendment of Section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Mr. Cline indicated that he had not yet been able to talk to Representative Rodino about it but he hoped to set up a meeting with Mr. Rodino, himself and Mr. Warner for later in the week or next week. He will advise.

CONFIDENTIAL

June 17, 1965

Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives on August 19, 1959, Mr. John A. Johnson, General Counsel of NASA, made the following statement as to the requirement of section 305(a) (hearings on Public Law 85-568, pp. 73-74):

"Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. DADDARIO, I have read into the record section 305(a), which provides that upon the making of these statutory determinations, the title to the patentable invention shall vest in the Government unless the Administrator waives the rights of the Government.

"Under that provision, even though there is another provision in the act that provides for class waivers, we have felt it would be a clear violation of the total spirit of section 305 were the Administrator to make a determination that says, in effect: 'I am going to waive title to all inventions produced by contractors in a particular segment of industry, or in all cases where the Department of Defense is already contracting with a particular contractor on similar research and development work, without knowing in advance precisely what the invention is going to be.' It has seemed to us that the only conscientious way of administering the act is to require that the inventions be reported, that the determinations be made, and that waiver take place afterward. Now, we have in our waiver regulations indicated certain areas where we would deem a prima facie case for waiver to be made out, but even there we have felt we couldn't say with certainty that waiver would be granted, because the spirit of the present law seems to require a conscientious case-by-case determination.

"Therefore, the result of this law, as we have interpreted it, has been to require that our contracting practices with that portion of industry doing business with the Defense Department be essentially different from the Defense Department. It requires that the reporting of the inventions be made, and then an administrative determination be made, followed by a decision to waive or not to waive the invention, whereas under the Department of Defense procedure the contractor could be assured by contract that title to the invention would be retained by the contractor with only a license given to the Government."

Later, in giving testimony on December 9, 1959, before a subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business of the Senate, Mr. Johnson stated (hearings on the "Effect of Federal Patent Policies on Competition, Monopoly, Economic Growth, and Small Business," p. 261):

"I think I should say one more thing more about our waiver policy. Contractors have requested that we include in our contract provisions certain assurances that inventions in certain classes will be waived if such inventions are made.

"We have taken the position that the type of contract provision would be inconsistent with the apparent purpose of section 305. It appears to us that we should not grant waivers in advance of the making of the invention because of the great difficulty, if not impossibility, of determining with any degree of assurance that the interests of the United States would be served by waiver before the precise nature of the invention is known. So we have not included in our contracts any such provisions, and we have informed contractors that this matter is not open to negotiation."

The practice of NASA before the adoption of the revised waiver regulations referred to above was in harmony with the provisions of section 305, as shown by the following extract from an article written by Mr. Johnson in 1961 (21 Federal Bar Journal 37, 47):

"Although the waiver authority of the Administrator extends to any invention or class of inventions made or which may be

made in the performance of work under a NASA contract, NASA has adopted the policy of not granting any waivers in advance of the making of the invention because of the great difficulty, if not impossibility, of determining with any degree of assurance that the interests of the United States would be served by waiver before the precise nature of the invention is known.

"Petitions for waiver may be filed by a contractor, an assignee of a contractor, or an inventor who was not under an obligation to assign the invention to the contractor by which he was employed when the invention was made. In every case, the petitioner has the privilege of an oral hearing before the NASA Inventions and Contributions Board, which has the statutory duty of transmitting to the Administrator its findings of fact with respect to each proposal for waiver and its recommendations for action.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 3, 1965]

WHICH WAY ON PATENTS?

The dispute over the ownership of patents issued for discoveries made in the course of federally financed research and development work has taken a new and ominous turn. A well-organized lobbying campaign mounted by the drug industry, the electronics industry, and the organized universities has on two occasions defeated Senator RUSSELL B. LONG in his efforts to make those discoveries freely available to the public. Unless the administration adopts a clear-cut position, the patents issued from the work on \$15 billion of Federal research contracts may fall into the hands of those who have little interest in utilizing or diffusing new knowledge.

From the time that Eli Whitney got a contract to develop interchangeable parts for rifles in the administration of President George Washington until recent times, the policy on patents arising out of Government-sponsored research was clear. The Federal Government took title to the patents and made them freely available to the public. But that wise principle has been breached, and now lobbyists are busy promoting legislation that would give individual administrators enormous discretion in waiving the Government's patent rights when such action is in "the public interest."

In the debate that centered around the appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and in the committee hearings on the Health, Education and Welfare legislation, Senator LONG's opponents argued that his amendment would cause private industry to withdraw from Federal research and development work. The Long amendment reserves patents for the Government except where "background knowledge" is involved. But not once did any of them adduce evidence to support their contention. The fact of the matter is that few of the industry and university groups which are demanding exclusive titles to patents are in a position to spurn the attractive, cost-plus Government contracts. And those which can proceed with their own research should be encouraged to do so. There is no good reason why the Government must pay for as much as 70 percent of the research and development work that is done in this country.

One of the reasons for defeating or tabling Senator LONG's amendment is that the matter of patents is being investigated by Senator McCLELLAN's Judiciary Subcommittee. Three bills have been submitted to that body, one each by Senators SALTONSTALL, LONG and McCLELLAN. The bill submitted by Mr. SALTONSTALL is, to put it bluntly, a vehicle for the wholesale transfer of patent rights to the industries which have worked with public funds. The McClellan bill, which has strong lobby support, is putatively a moderate measure. But it in fact gives individual

administrators broad authority to determine when the waiver of Government patent rights is in the public interest, a provision that would surely lead to troublesome discrepancies in the policies pursued by the various Government agencies.

Only Senator LONG's bill protects the public's stake in patents that are financed with tax funds. It deserves the enthusiastic support of the White House which has to date assumed a position of detachment.

Mr. HART. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG of Louisiana in the chair). The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

AA — Hart Bill file wmk
NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the formation of the National Committee for Immigration Reform.

This Committee has been in the process of formation since early May. Letters of invitation were sent to a representative group of leaders in the fields of religion, business, labor, education, science, and the professions. The letters, signed by former Under Secretary of State and U.S. Ambassador Robert Murphy, were written in behalf of Walker L. Cisar, chairman of the board of the Detroit Edison Co.; George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO; and Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of Radio Corp. of America. Nathan Strauss III, the New York City civic leader, is chairman of the organizing committee.

Of the some 400 invitations mailed, I am informed that only 4 declinations were received on the basis of opposition to the administration's immigration proposal. The membership of the Committee now totals 250.

The statement of principle, endorsed by all members of the Committee, points out that the national origins provision of our present immigration law is detrimental to our international interests, breeds hatred and hostility toward the United States, blocks comity among nations, and is a hindrance to our Nation's policy of peace among nations, without serving any national need or serving any international purpose of the United States. It further states that the National Committee for Immigration Reform endorses enactment this session of Congress of the essential provisions of the administration's immigration proposal as introduced by myself and 32 other Members of the Senate and by Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, and a large number of Members of the House.

The impressive list of membership of the committee indicates the widespread citizen support for immigration reform as proposed by the President.

The list includes two former Presidents—Eisenhower and Truman; two former Secretaries of the Treasury—Robert B. Anderson and Douglas Dillon; and two former Attorneys General—Herbert Brownell and J. Howard McGrath. It also includes 19 union presidents, including George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, and leading religious and civic leaders representing every geographical area of the country.

Yesterday a representative group of the members of the National Committee for Immigration Reform, headed by Gen. David Sarnoff, visited briefly with President Johnson and assured him of their continuing support for the principles of the administration's immigration proposals. There is no doubt that the impressive support evidenced by the formation of this national committee will be one of the more significant reasons for our success in enacting the President's proposals in this session of the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement of purpose of the National Committee for Immigration Reform, Mr. Robert Murphy's statement at a news conference held on June 14, and a list of the present membership of the committee be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The National Committee for Immigration Reform is a voluntary, nonpartisan organization of private citizens dedicated solely to the cause of promoting a fair and nondiscriminatory immigration law. To accomplish this purpose, the committee will work closely with organizations and individuals active in the immigration field to provide information to Congress and the American people and to urge appropriate action.

The present immigration law, enacted in 1952 over a Presidential veto, continues the discriminatory national-origins quota system adopted in the early 1920's. That system allocates annual quotas to countries outside the Western Hemisphere according to the supposed national origins of the American population in 1920, and requires selection of immigrants on the basis of race or ethnic origin. The national-origins system is based upon the statutory presumption that some people are inferior to others solely because of their birth, without regard to their worth.

By discriminating among nations on the basis of birthplace, the national-origins provisions is detrimental to our international interests, breeds hatred and hostility toward the United States, blocks comity among nations, and is a hindrance to our Nation's policy of peace among nations, without serving any national need or serving any international purpose of the United States.

As a device to control immigration by predetermined percentages of national and racial stocks, the national origins system has been a failure. In the entire period since the 1952 law was enacted, only approximately one-third of all aliens admitted to the United States were quota immigrants admitted in accordance with racial or national eligibility. Despite this fact, the entire fabric of our immigration law has been blemished by the discriminatory national origins system.

The last four American Presidents—Johnson, Kennedy, Eisenhower, and Truman—have all opposed continuation of the national origins feature of our law. Our last four Secretaries of State—Rusk, Herter, Dulles, and Acheson—have urged that our foreign relations demand a change of the immigration law in this respect. Our last four Attorneys General—Katzenbach, Kennedy, Rogers, and Brownell—also urged Congress to change these discriminatory provisions.

The National Committee for Immigration Reform endorses enactment in this session of Congress of the essential provisions of S. 500 (Introduced by Senator Hart and 32 other

Senators of both parties) and the identical H.R. 2580 (Introduced by Congressman Celler and some 35 other Congressmen of both parties).

These bills would—

1. Abolish the national origins quota system and replace it with an equitable principle of selection on a first-come, first-served basis, within preference categories, subject to a limit of immigration from any one country to 10 percent of the annual total ceiling;

2. Establish a permanent provision for dealing with future refugee emergencies which may arise.

These bills would—

1. Not substantially raise the present authorized ceilings of total immigration to the United States;

2. Not change the present system of priorities based on skills of the prospective immigrants and family reunion;

3. Not change existing health and security qualifications;

4. Not change existing protections for American workers against foreign competition for jobs of Americans.

In short, the major and principal change proposed by these bills is to eliminate selection of immigrants on the basis of ancestry or birthplace and substitute the test of selection based on the immigrant's potential personal contribution to the United States and on the concept of family reunion—standards which are fairer to aliens and more beneficial to Americans.

The National Committee for Immigration Reform endorses the essential principles of S. 500 and H.R. 2580. By concentrating our energies and resources on this single task, we hope to aid in focusing public and congressional attention upon this issue and thus secure enactment of a fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory immigration law.

STATEMENT BY MR. ROBERT MURPHY, MEMBER, NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM, JUNE 14, 1965, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I am both gratified and encouraged by the overwhelmingly favorable response to our letter of invitation to religious, business, labor, and civic leaders to join in support of the basic principles of the administration's immigration reform program.

The letter of invitation, signed by me, was written in behalf of Walker L. Cisler, chairman, Detroit Edison Co.; George Meany, president, AFL-CIO; and David Sarnoff, chairman, Radio Corp. of America. Nathan Straus III, of New York City, has agreed to serve as chairman of the organizing committee.

The full committee now numbers more than 200 members and expressions of support for the committee's goal are still coming in—including support from publishers and heads of other communications media.

I speak with conviction in terms of the need for immigration reform—conviction that it is a three-pronged weapon that can help to wage the peace.

First, it will reveal to the world at large that humanitarianism is a foremost principle in our American tradition. The moral principle involved in family reunion is one in which we believe.

Second, I feel that this long-overdue reform can make an important contribution in our relations with other countries. It can prove to the world that we are determined to ban ethnic and racial bigotry.

Third, it is to our own best self-interest in gaining skills to advance our scientific and technical progress.

President Johnson, in his recent Chicago speech outlining our country's aim to keep the peace, stated: "The consensus within America today is a consensus of courage."

It is difficult for me to believe that any American fears the small numerical increase

in immigrants who will come into this country under the administration's proposal. The issue is not one of numbers—the issue is how we bring these people in.

One of the problems we face is the lack of understanding about the proposed immigration reform. And the problem of general public apathy in the face of the minority, but very vocal opposition, which adds to the confusion. It is because of this lack of understanding and misinformation that we felt the need for our committee.

Briefly, the administration's proposal recommends two major changes in the present law: (1) Abolish the national origins quota system and replace it with an equitable principle of selection on a first-come, first-served basis, within preference categories, subject to a limit of immigration from any one country to 10 percent of the annual total ceiling; and (2) establish a permanent provision for dealing with future refugee emergencies which may arise. The proposal was introduced by Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, and Senator PHILIP A. HART, Democrat, of Michigan, and has bipartisan support.

The total number of quota immigrants now authorized is 158,000 a year and under the administration's bill it would be about 166,000—an increase of approximately 8,000 a year. Actually, because the bill would authorize the use of quota numbers that now are authorized but unused, it would result in an increase in immigration of about 60,000 a year. This figure is about 2 percent of the present natural increase in our population and obviously can have little practical effect on population growth.

The proposal would not change the present system of priorities based on skills of the prospective immigrants and family reunion. Nor would it change existing health and security qualifications. Nor existing protections for American workers against foreign competition.

Hordes of immigrants will not flood our shores.

Americans will not lose their jobs to foreign competition.

Subversives will not infiltrate our democratic form of Government.

Taxpayers will not be forced to pay the bill for public assistance to unemployed, unskilled or unwilling immigrant workers and their families.

To the contrary, recent history reveals that skilled and professionally trained immigrants can make an important contribution in areas of shortages in this country.

During the 1954-64 period, approximately 36,461 immigrants with engineering training helped to fill this country's needs in this field—more than total the number of engineers receiving degrees in the United States in 1964. During this same 10-year period, there were other fields in which this country realized important gains in what has been called "human capital"—18,424 physicians and surgeons, 36,858 nurses, 6,335 chemists, 1,610 physicists, and 17,209 technicians came to the United States.

The national origins quota system was designed to preserve the balance of national and racial origins as it existed in our country in 1920. Heavily favoring northern European countries, it discriminates against countries of southern and eastern Europe and Asia and Africa. Under this archaic law, 70 percent of the total annual quota is reserved for the United Kingdom, Ireland, and Germany—unfulfilled for many years—the remaining 30 percent shared by more than 100 other countries and areas. Under the present law, western and northern Europe are allotted 82 percent; southern and eastern Europe 16 percent; with only 2 percent for Asia, Africa, and the Pacific area.

Congress has, over the years, enacted special legislation and private bills to help overcome the most blatant injustices. But it has not eliminated the basic problem—

June 17, 1965

the discriminatory and undemocratic selective national origins quota system.

One of the distinguished members of our committee is former President Dwight D. Eisenhower. In calling for an end to the discriminatory treatment accorded immigrants, President Eisenhower in 1960 sent to the Congress a special message in which he said:

"The contributions of successive waves of immigrants show that they do not bring their families to a strange land and learn a new language and a new way of life simply to indulge themselves with comforts.

"The names of those who make important contributions in the field of science, law and almost every other field of endeavor indicate that there has been no period in which immigrants to this country have not richly regarded it for its liberality in receiving them."

President Kennedy urged similar action by the Congress. President Johnson, in calling on Congress to act, stated:

"In establishing preferences a nation that was built by the immigrants of all lands can ask those who now seek admission: 'What can you do for our country?' But we should not be asking: 'In what country were you born?'"

By concentrating our energies and resources on focusing public and congressional attention on the need for immigration reform, we hope to help secure enactment of a fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory immigration law.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM¹

Nathan Straus III, chairman, organizing committee.

Walker L. Cislser, chairman, Detroit Edison Co.

Georgé Meany, president, AFL-CIO.
Robert Murphy, chairman, Corning Glass International.

David Sarnoff, chairman, Radio Corp. of America.

Gladys Uhl, director of information.
Hon. Dwight D. Eisenhower.
Hon. Harry S. Truman.
Hon. Robert Anderson.
Hon. Douglas Dillon.
Hon. Herbert Brownell.
Hon. J. Howard McGrath.
I. W. Abel, president, United Steelworkers of America, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Harry Akin, president, Night Hawk Restaurants, Austin, Tex.

H. R. Albrecht, president, North Dakota State University, Fargo, N. Dak.
Winthrop W. Aldrich, New York, N.Y.
Stanley C. Allyn, Dayton, Ohio.
Frank Altschul, New York, N.Y.
Mrs. Eugenia Anderson, Red Wing, Minn.
Robert B. Anderson, New York, N.Y.
Albert E. Arent, attorney, Washington, D.C.
Steven Ashcraft, Craft's Drug Stores, Spartanburg, S.C.

Harold L. Bache, New York, N.Y.
Max W. Bay, M.D., Los Angeles, Calif.
Jefferson A. Beaver, San Francisco, Calif.
Robert B. Begley, president, The Begley Drug Co., Richmond, Ky.

J. A. Belrne, president, Communications Workers of America, Washington, D.C.
Mrs. George Bell, Washington, D.C.

Robert S. Benjamin, chairman of the board, United Artists Corp., New York, N.Y.

Dr. John C. Bennett, president, Union Theological Seminary, New York, N.Y.

William Benton, publisher and chairman, Encyclopedia Britannica, New York, N.Y.

¹ Persons included on this list are serving in their individual capacities; where organizational identification is made, it is in each case for the purpose of identification only.

Leonard Bernstein, Philharmonic Hall, New York, N.Y.

Hans A. Bethe, Cornell University, Laboratory of Nuclear Studies, Ithaca, N.Y.
Nicholas D. Biddle, New York, N.Y.

Walter H. Bieringer, executive vice president, Plymouth Rubber Co., Inc., Canton, Mass.

Barry Bingham, editor and publisher, The Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky.

Joseph P. Binns, New York, N.Y.
Rev. Eugene Carson Blake, Philadelphia, Pa.

Jacob Blaustein, Baltimore, Md.
Joseph L. Block, chairman, Inland Steel Co., Chicago, Ill.

Sam R. Bloom, Dallas, Tex.
George M. Bragallini, vice president, Manufacturers Hanover Trust, New York, N.Y.

Harry Brandt, New York, N.Y.
R. James Brennan, Rapid City, S. Dak.

Detlev W. Bronk, president, the Rockefeller Institute, New York, N.Y.

Herbert Brownell, Lord, Day & Lord, New York, N.Y.

George Burdon, president, United Rubber Workers of America, Akron, Ohio.
Cass Canfield, New York, N.Y.

Fred H. Carmichael, Asheville, N.C.
Leo Cherne, executive director, the Research Institute of America, Inc., New York, N.Y.

George L. Chumbley, Jr., vice president, the Battery Park Hotel, Asheville, N.C.

Walker L. Cislser, chairman, the Detroit Edison Co., Detroit, Mich.

Kenneth B. Clark, Social Dynamics Research Institute, City University of New York, New York, N.Y.

Abram Claude, Jr., vice president, Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., New York, N.Y.

Gen. Lucius Clay, New York, N.Y.
Jacob Clayman, IUD-AFL-CIO, Washington, D.C.

Ben Cohen, Washington, D.C.
Henry Commager, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.

Donald C. Cook, president, American Electric Power Co., New York, N.Y.

Thomas M. Cooley, II, dean, University of Pittsburgh School of Law, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Edward Corsi, New York, N.Y.
Glenn M. Coulter, Detroit, Mich.

Norman Cousins, Saturday Review of Literature, New York, N.Y.

Gardner Cowles, chairman of the board and editor in chief, Cowles Magazines & Broadcasting, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Harry B. Cunningham, president, S. S. Kresge Co., Detroit, Mich.

Joseph Curran, president, National Maritime Union of America, New York, N.Y.

Edward L. Cushman, vice president, American Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich.

Most Reverend Richard Cardinal Cushing, Boston, Mass.

J. de Cubas, president, Westinghouse Electric International, New York, N.Y.

Thomas J. Deegan, Jr., New York, N.Y.
Fred Delliquadri, dean, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Hon. Douglas Dillon, New York, N.Y.
Dr. John S. Dickey, president, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N.H.

Carling Dinkler, Jr., chairman of the board, Dinkler Hotel Corp., Atlanta, Ga.

Morgan J. Doughton, chairman, Managerial Dynamics, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Rt. Rev. Horace W. B. Donegan, bishop of New York, New York, N.Y.

Lewis W. Douglas, New York, N.Y.
R. E. Driscoll, Jr., Kellar & Kellar & Driscoll, Lead, S. Dak.

David Dubinsky, president, International Ladies Garment Workers' Union, New York, N.Y.

Allen W. Dulles, Washington, D.C.
Herbert B. Ehrmann, Boston, Mass.

Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, president, Union of American Hebrew Cong., New York, N.Y.

Milton L. Eisberg, president, Drug Fair, Alexandria, Va.

George M. Eisey, Washington, D.C.
Everett H. Erlick, vice president and general counsel, American Broadcasting-Paramount Theaters, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Luther H. Evans, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

James A. Farley, chairman, Coca Cola Export Corp., New York, N.Y.

James E. Faust, attorney at law, Salt Lake City, Utah.

William J. Feldstein, Milwaukee, Wis.
Mrs. Laura Fermi, Chicago, Ill.

E. H. Foley, Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe, Washington, D.C.

Frank M. Folsom, chairman of the executive committee, Radio Corp. of America, New York, N.Y.

Marion B. Folsom, Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N.Y.

John B. Ford III, Detroit, Mich.
Berent Friele, New York, N.Y.

Jack Fruchtman, 114 West Lexington Street, Baltimore, Md.

Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Buell G. Gallagher, president, the City University of New York, New York, N.Y.

Sylvester J. Garamella, New York, N.Y.
Gen. James M. Gavin, chairman, Arthur D. Little, Inc., Cambridge, Mass.

Bruce A. Gimbel, president, Gimbel Bros., Inc., New York, N.Y.

Harry Golden, the Carolina Israelite, Charlotte, N.C.

Eric F. Goldman, special consultant to the President, the White House, Washington, D.C.

Samuel Goldwyn, Los Angeles, Calif.
William P. Gray, Gray, Pfaelzer & Robertson, Los Angeles, Calif.

Arnold S. Gregory, Danville, Ky.
John J. Grogan, president, Industrial Union of Marine Workers, Camden, N.J.

Harry E. Gould, New York, N.Y.
Mason W. Gross, president, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.

Gen. Alfred Gruenther, Washington, D.C.
Paul Hall, president, the Seafarers International Union, Brooklyn, N.Y.

James Hamilton, National Council of Churches, Washington, D.C.

Oscar Handlin, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

John W. Hanes, Jr., New York, N.Y.
John A. Hannah, president, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.

Marion Harper, Jr., New York, N.Y.
George M. Harrison, chief executive officer, Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Thomas B. Harvey, Philadelphia, Pa.
John C. Hazen, vice president, National Retail Merchants Association, Washington, D.C.

August Heckscher, New York, N.Y.
Ben W. Heineman, chairman, Chicago & North Western Railway Co., Chicago, Ill.

Ernest Henderson, chairman, Sheraton Corp. of America, Boston, Mass.

Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, CSC president, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.

Miss Jane M. Hoey, New York, N.Y.
Mrs. Anna Rosenberg Hoffman, New York, N.Y.

Sidney Hollander, Baltimore, Md.
Mrs. Hiram Cole Houghton, Iowa City, Iowa.

Palmer Hoyt, editor, and publisher, the Denver Post, Denver, Colo.

Archbishop Iakovas, New York, N.Y.
Paul Jennings, president, Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, Washington, D.C.

Devereux C. Josephs, New York, N.Y.
J. M. Kaplan, New York, N.Y.

Jerome J. Keating, president, National Association of Letter Carriers, Washington, D.C.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 17, 1965

Joseph D. Keenan, international secretary, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Washington, D.C.
 Herman Kenin, president, American Federation of Musicians, New York, N.Y.
 Dr. Clark Kerr, president, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.
 Mrs. Marcus Kilch, president, National Council of Catholic Women, Washington, D.C.
 Robert C. Kirkwood, chairman, F. W. Woolworth Co., New York, N.Y.
 Robert Huntington Knight, Sherman & Sterling, New York, N.Y.
 Alfred A. Knopf, Purchase, N.Y.
 David Lloyd Kreeger, president, Government Employees Insurance Co., Washington, D.C.
 Arthur B. Krim, president, United Artists Corp., New York, N.Y.
 Most Reverend John Krol, archbishop of Philadelphia.
 C. B. Larsen, chairman, executive committee, Cunningham Drug Stores, Inc., Detroit, Mich.
 Sidney Lawrence, director, Community Relations Bureau, Kansas City, Mo.
 Ralph Lazarus, president, Federated Department Stores, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 K. C. Lee, the Chinese Journal, New York, N.Y.
 Robert Lehman, Lehman Bros., New York, N.Y.
 Samuel B. Leidesdorf, New York, N.Y.
 Sid B. Levine, Beverly Hills, Calif.
 D. M. Lilly, Toro Manufacturing Corp., Minneapolis, Minn.
 Sol M. Linowitz, chairman, Xerox Corp., Rochester, N.Y.
 Mrs. Clair Booth Luce, Phoenix, Ariz.
 Henry R. Luce, Phoenix, Ariz.
 L. C. Lustenberger, president, W. T. Grant Co., New York, N.Y.
 Florence Mahoney, Washington, D.C.
 Julius Manger, Jr., chairman, Manger Hotels Cos., New York, N.Y.
 Stanley Marcus, Neiman-Marcus, Dallas, Tex.
 Judge Juvenal Marchisio, New York, N.Y.
 George M. Mardikian, San Francisco, Calif.
 Luis Munoz Marin, San Juan, Puerto Rico.
 Rev. Dr. Julius Mark, Congregation Emanu-El, New York, N.Y.
 Woodrow D. Marriott, Marriott-Hot Shops, Inc., Washington, D.C.
 Joseph Martin, Jr., San Francisco, Calif.
 John McCarthy, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D.C.
 Paul M. McCloskey, Jr., McCloskey, Wilson, Mosher & Martin, Palo Alto, Calif.
 Ralph McGill, publisher, Atlanta Constitution, Atlanta, Ga.
 J. Howard McGrath, Washington, D.C.
 John J. McGrath, Allied Stores Corp., New York, N.Y.
 Most Reverend Archbishop, McIntyre, Los Angeles, Calif.
 George Meany, president, AFL-CIO, Washington, D.C.
 Samuel W. Meek, New York, N.Y.
 Dr. William C. Menninger, The Menninger Foundation, Topeka, Kans.
 Yehudi Menuhin, London, England.
 Mrs. Helen Kirkpatrick Milbank, Marlboro, N.H.
 Howard Moore, Jr., Atlanta, Ga.
 Arturo Morales-Carrion, Pan American Union, Washington, D.C.
 Edward P. Morgan, Washington, D.C.
 Teodoro Moscoso, chairman, executive committee, Banco De Ponce, Santurce, Puerto Rico.
 Robert Moses, New York, N.Y.
 Robert Murphy, chairman, Corning Glass International, New York, N.Y.
 John Courtney Murray, S. J., Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md.

Most Reverend Archbishop O'Boyle, Washington, D.C.
 James E. O'Brien, Pillsbury, Madison & Sutro, San Francisco, Calif.
 Roderick L. O'Connor, vice president, CIBA Corp., Fair Lawn, N.J.
 Robert S. Oelman, chairman, the National Cash Register Co., Dayton, Ohio.
 Frederick O'Neal, president, Actors Equity Association, New York, N.Y.
 John Ottaviano, Jr., supreme venerable, New Haven, Conn.
 Dr. H. A. Overstreet, Falls Church, Va.
 Mrs. H. A. Overstreet, Falls Church, Va.
 William S. Paley, chairman, Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., New York, N.Y.
 James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union, Washington, D.C.
 Mrs. Malcolm E. Peabody, Cambridge, Mass.
 Drew Pearson, Washington, D.C.
 Roland Pierotti, executive vice president, Bank of America, San Francisco, Calif.
 Rt. Rev. James A. Pike, San Francisco, Calif.
 Phillip W. Pillsbury, chairman of the board, the Pillsbury Co., Minneapolis, Minn.
 William Pollack, general president, Textile Workers Union of America, New York, N.Y.
 Fortune Pope, publisher, 11 Progresso, New York, N.Y.
 Jacob S. Potofsky, general president, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, New York, N.Y.
 George D. Pratt, Jr., Bridgewater, Conn.
 Maxwell M. Rabb, New York, N.Y.
 Dr. I. S. Ravdin, University Hospital, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Dr. James M. Read, Wilmington College, Wilmington, Ohio.
 Walter P. Reuther, president, United Auto Workers International Union, Detroit, Mich.
 Irving G. Rhodes, the Wisconsin Jewish Chronicle, Milwaukee, Wis.
 Emil Rieve, Hollywood, Fla.
 David Rockefeller, New York, N.Y.
 Mrs. Mary G. Roebling, chairman of the board, Trenton Trust Co., Trenton, N.J.
 Harry N. Rosenfield, attorney, Washington, D.C.
 Lessing J. Rosenwald, Jenkintown, Pa.
 William Rosenwald, New York, N.Y.
 Pierre Sallinger, Beverly Hills, Calif.
 Dr. Jonas Salk, San Diego, Calif.
 Howard J. Samuels, president, Kordite Corp., Macedon, N.Y.
 Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman, Radio Corp. of America, New York, N.Y.
 Stuart T. Saunders, chairman of board, the Pennsylvania Railroad, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Dore Schary, New York, N.Y.
 Harry Scherman, Book of the Month Club, Inc., New York, N.Y.
 Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Washington, D.C.
 Charles H. Schneider, editor, Memphis Press-Scimitar, Memphis, Tenn.
 Jack Sheehan, United Steelworkers of America, Washington, D.C.
 Mrs. Harper Sibley, Rochester, N.Y.
 Norton Simon, Fullerton, Calif.
 Ross D. Siragusa, chairman of the board, Admiral Corp., Chicago, Ill.
 William B. Spann, Jr., Austin Miller & Gaines, Atlanta, Ga.
 Philip Sporn, chairman, American Electric Power Co., Inc., New York, N.Y.
 Gen. Carl A. Spaatz, USAF, retired, Chevy Chase, Md.
 Ceslovas Staniulis, president, American Lithuanian Engineers Association, Inc., Dearborn, Mich.
 Philip M. Stern, Washington, D.C.
 Mark C. Stevens, vice president, Detroit Bank & Trust, Detroit, Mich.
 Alan M. Stroock, New York, N.Y.
 Walter S. Surrey, Washington, D.C.
 Benjamin H. Swig, chairman, Fairmont Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.

Charles P. Taft, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 Dr. Edward Teller, University of California, Livermore, Calif.
 Dr. Paul Tillich, Divinity School, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 Maynard J. Toll, O'Melveny & Meyers, Los Angeles, Calif.
 Ben Touster, New York, N.Y.
 Hon. Harry S. Truman, Independence, Mo.
 Maxwell M. Upson, New York, N.Y.
 William J. vanden Heuvel, Washington, D.C.
 Frank J. Vodrazka, president, Czechoslovak Society of America, Cicero, Ill.
 Thomas J. Watson, Jr., chairman, IBM, New York, N.Y.
 Sidney J. Weinberg, Goldman, Sachs & Co., New York, N.Y.
 Edwin L. Weisl, Sr., New York, N.Y.
 Edwin J. Wesely, New York, N.Y.
 Dr. Gilbert F. White, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 Dr. Paul Dudley White, Boston, Mass.
 Edward S. Wikera, M.D., Dearborn, Mich.
 Harvey Williams, president, the Company for Investing Abroad, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Stanley Woodward, Washington, D.C.
 Jerry Wurf, international president, American Federation of State, County & Municipal Employees, Washington, D.C.
 James K. Zotolas, New York, N.Y.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. MORSE, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 2160) to amend section 305 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 with respect to the disposition of proprietary rights in inventions made thereunder, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG of Louisiana in the chair). If there is no further business to come before the Senate, under the previous order, the Senate will now stand adjourned until Monday, at 12 o'clock noon.

Thereupon (at 8 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Monday, June 21, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 17, 1965:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Frederick Joseph Brown, O16761, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

June 16, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

13335

the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian nations.

Twenty-five years have passed since that fateful occurrence and this is the sad occasion we now commemorate. It is the fervent hope of countless millions of friends of the Baltic peoples that one day they will again enjoy liberty and freedom.

It is toward this end that I have introduced a Baltic States resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 26. It is my sincere hope that legislation along these lines will be approved by the Congress. The text of that resolution follows:

H. CON. RES. 26

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania and the other two Baltic States, Estonia and Latvia, by legal or democratic processes; and

Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia by force of arms; and

Whereas the Baltic people, Lithuanians, Estonians, and Latvians, under Communist control were and still are overwhelmingly anti-Communist; and

Whereas Lithuanians, Estonians, and Latvians desire, fight, and die for their national independence; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America maintains diplomatic relations with the Governments of the Baltic nations of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia and consistently has refused to recognize their seizure and forced "incorporation" into the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republic; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States of America request the President of the United States to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and ask that the United Nations request the Soviets (a) to withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, (b) to return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons, and slave-labor camps.

SEC. 2. It is further the sense of the Congress that the United Nations should conduct free elections in Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia under its supervision.

A NEW COMMITMENT TO THE UNITED NATIONS

(Mr. MATHIAS (at the request of Mr. GROVER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the Congress the following statement, issued today by myself and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH], the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE], the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID], and the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER]:

A NEW COMMITMENT TO THE UNITED NATIONS
(Joint statement by Congressmen ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, FRANK HORTON, CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR., F. BRADFORD MORSE, OGDEN R. REID, and STANLEY R. TUPPER)

On June 26, the world will celebrate the 20th anniversary of the United Nations Charter. Today, as 20 years ago, the United Nations is the only global machinery for peace. The political realities of the nuclear age have obscured the commitment that was made at the San Francisco Conference of

1945. If the United Nations is to survive the next score of years the dedication of its members today must match the dedication of those who signed the charter in San Francisco. For its part, the United States must give new testimony of its faith, a new declaration of belief and optimism in the capacity of the United Nations to serve the cause of peace—and of all men.

Those who suggest that the United Nations has not lived up to the full potential seen for it at the San Francisco Conference in 1945 are actually passing commentary on the inability of the five major powers to reach agreement on international crises. The United Nations is not an organization more perfect than man, nor was it intended to be. The fact that the veto for the major powers was included in the charter was tantamount to recognition that the United Nations could act effectively only when great power interests were not directly in conflict.

"The United Nations," wrote Arthur Vandenberg in 1947, "is neither an automatic nor a perfect instrument. Like any other human institution, it will make mistakes. It must live and learn. It must grow from strength to strength * * *. It must deserve to survive." Twenty years have shown the world that the organization deserves not only to survive but to expand its influence at a pace equal to the changes in the modern world community.

Rather than to discredit the United Nations by emphasizing that it has not built an irrevocably stable peace, we should all be grateful that for 20 years it has helped to prevent and limit international conflict. Wherever U.N. operations have been undertaken—in Korea, in Greece, in Kashmir, in the Middle East, in the Congo, in Cyprus—the United Nations has promoted peace, and in so doing has served the interests of the United States.

In a nuclear world, peace with freedom cannot be found in the illusion of isolation or in a retreat from reality. It can be found only in a blend of determination to resist aggression and determination to seek peace through communication, patience, and debate. As a forum for negotiations, as a focal point for communication between nations, and as a vital inducement to economic and social progress the United Nations is both a symbol of optimism for the future and a very practical instrument of peace.

In a large measure the effect of the U.N. on the national interests of the United States will be influenced by and depend upon the role the United States plays in the organization. As the great power most clearly and most consistently identified with the shared purposes of the U.N. membership, the United States is the greatest single influence on what the United Nations is, does, and can be. To talk about the future of the United Nations therefore, is in substantial measure to talk about the future of the United States participation in it.

This is the proper perspective from which to view the current crisis at the U.N. The United States, together with all members, must make a new pledge of faith to the United Nations and to the principles which we share in common.

Articles 43, 44, and 45 of the United Nations Charter authorize arrangements by which members can make national forces available to the Security Council. The establishment of a permanent internationalized United Nations police force is still far away because members are not yet ready to commit in advance their nationals to fight in a cause which has not yet been determined.

Operations in Korea, the Middle East, the Congo, Yemen, and Cyprus have all required the ad hoc formation of a United Nations force to carry out U.N. directives or recommendations. In some instances, particularly in Cyprus, the delay in being able to form and land a United Nations force may have

contributed to the difficulties of restoring stability.

Many persons, notably Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy, Prime Minister Lester Pearson of Canada, and U.N. Secretary General U Thant, have recommended that, without jeopardizing the potential of an internationalized force, members earmark contingents of their national forces for potential use by the United Nations in peacekeeping or peace-enforcing operations. At Harvard University on June 12, 1963, the Secretary General stated his case:

"We have already shown that, when the situation demands it, it is possible to use the soldiers of many countries for objectives which are not national ones and that the soldiers respond magnificently to this challenge. We have also seen that, when the situation is serious enough, governments are prepared to waive certain of the attributes of national sovereignty in the interest of keeping the peace through the United Nations. We have demonstrated that a loyalty to international service can exist side by side with legitimate national pride.

"And, perhaps most important of all, we have shown that there can be a practical alternative to the deadly ultimate struggle and that it is an alternative which brings out the good and generous qualities in men rather than their destructive and selfish qualities.

"Although it is perhaps too early to consider the establishment of a permanent United Nations force, I believe there are a number of measures which could be taken even now to improve on our present capacity for meeting dangerous situations. It would be extremely desirable, for example, if suitable units which could be made available at short notice for United Nations service and thereby decrease the degree of improvisation necessary in an emergency."

The forces either could be part of the national forces on ordinary defense assignment or could be kept as a separate unit of the national forces. In either case, until called for by the U.N. they would be paid by the member government. No such forces would ever be used without the full consent of the member.

Many nations have answered the call. Canada, Iran, Italy, and the Netherlands have all earmarked units of their national forces for U.N. use. The four Scandinavian countries (Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Finland) are creating a special permanent Scandinavian standby force to be on call for U.N. operations. Britain has indicated its willingness to provide significant logistical support for U.N. operations.

The U.S. administration has applauded these steps by others but as yet has not taken similar action of its own. In an article for the New York Times magazine of April 27, 1964, over a year ago, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, Richard N. Gardner, wrote:

"U.N. members, as Secretary General U Thant suggested last year in a speech to Harvard alumni, should earmark military units which they might be prepared to make available on request by the United Nations. Earmarking would be voluntary and, unlike a standing army, the earmarked units would be financed and controlled by their governments and made available to the U.N."

We understand fully that for obvious political reasons the United Nations should not and cannot utilize U.S. troops in most of the peacekeeping operations it undertakes. Nonetheless the experience in the Congo and elsewhere has indicated clearly that the major powers can make substantial contributions in the form of transport and technical support.

We do not wish to minimize the crucial nature of the difficult political and financial decisions facing the United Nations and the U.S. administration in its policies toward the U.N. But we do suggest that much more is

required of the U.S. policy than only to find some answer to the current impasse which will conveniently allow us merely to continue. It is not enough just to find some way out of the current dilemma. In our view, the Nation must make a more meaningful pledge, a more tangible commitment to the future.

We propose that the United States make a twofold contribution to a standby U.N. force:

First, the services of the Military Air Transport System of the U.S. Department of Defense should be placed on permanent call to the United Nations for the transport of men and materiel in any U.N. peacekeeping operations. MATS has correctly been called the largest airline in the world. With 1,100 planes and 90,000 men operating out of nearly 100 bases around the world, it logged 1,066,325 flight hours in 1964 alone. It is responsible for the efficiency of the long-distance mobility of the Army—the capacity to put U.S. troops anywhere in the world before a crisis grows out of control.

MATS has served the U.N. before. In the Korean conflict, in the Lebanese crisis, and in the Congo it airlifted U.N. forces and supplies.

While the readiness of MATS to serve a U.N. mission might be assumed a direct and public commitment through a policy declaration of the U.S. Government would give assurance to U.N. personnel and would alert MATS personnel to the vital nature of their U.N. functions.

Second, the United States should create a small volunteer unit of approximately 1,000 men to stand ready to meet a U.N. call for emergency technical support for peacekeeping operations. The unit could be designated the First Brigade of the U.S. armed services (Forces for International Relief on Standby). It should include a company of experts in the establishment and maintenance of communications in crisis conditions, a company of Army and Navy engineers trained in the rapid construction of bridges, roads, and buildings, compact and highly mobile medical teams, technical advisers from the Quartermaster Corps to provide rapid information on the supply needs of any peacekeeping operation, an advisory group from MATS to provide rapid information on long-range transportation needs, a sizable staff of multilingual interpreters. These are all technical skills at which the U.S. Armed Forces excel, and which might be the most useful and politically feasible contribution which the United States can make in actual U.N. peacekeeping operations.

The First Brigade should have a permanent headquarters. Its personnel should consist only of men and women from the armed services who have volunteered for assignment. They should be given the physical inoculations and equipment necessary for service anywhere in the world on short notice. The entire brigade should be given training in basic language skills in order to facilitate communications with all nationalities. With a separate military designation and insignia, the brigade should be encouraged to consider its service as a unique contribution to the preservation of peace.

The First Brigade might also be available to serve U.N. or other worldwide efforts to counter the effects of natural disasters anywhere in the world—earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, or floods.

Of course, neither the First Brigade nor MATS would be available to the U.N. in any case where the United States expressly prohibits their use. The forces would be paid by the United States until activated by the United Nations, at which time they would be paid for in accordance with the agreed-upon U.N. financial arrangements for the operation. Nonetheless, the United States should never deprive the U.N. of the use of MATS or the First Brigade merely because financial ar-

rangements are not fully established or to our liking.

We know that the U.S. Armed Forces may be able to provide most of these services relatively quickly without a special unit. We know too that the American people and the administration are likely to respond favorably to any U.N. request for help, with or without a special unit. But we feel strongly that the creation of a new U.S. First Brigade for U.N. service can serve two vital needs:

First, it can maximize the efficiency of the technical personnel which the U.N. may need most urgently and thus give the U.N. officials confidence that the manpower and skills are available to do a difficult job.

Second, and even more important, the First Brigade would be a symbol of this Nation's faith in the United Nations and its most cherished principles. Let no nation and no leader doubt our commitment. Let all men, abroad and at home see that this Government believes in the United Nations, in its purposes and in its capacities.

There is no more important contribution that any people can make to the United Nations and its purposes than a continued effort to rise above the crises of today and to think of tomorrow—to shape the future to the image of our dream.

AA WK *Bill* Moore
IMMIGRATION BILL INTRODUCED

(Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. GROVER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced an immigration bill designed: first, to bring immediate relief to the thousands of relatives of U.S. citizens and eligible aliens throughout the world in the oversubscribed countries who have been waiting for years for their opportunity to immigrate to the United States, and second, replace the national origins quota system with a worldwide quota, except for the Western Hemisphere, which will admit aliens without reference to the country of their birth on the basis of their relationship to U.S. citizens and permanent residents, and their ability to contribute needed skills to the United States.

For a number of years there have gone unused in excess of 50,000 quota numbers per year because some countries have failed to make full use of their immigration quotas while in other countries the backlog of persons registered and waiting their turn has grown larger and larger.

In 1964 some 55,317 quota numbers were not used; but at the end of the year a total of 831,881 registrations were pending in the oversubscribed countries. A total of 178,515 waiting registrants held preference status as relatives or urgently needed skilled persons.

My bill will immediately relieve the tremendous pressure of this huge backlog by the allocation of a 3-year period of the unused quota numbers to the oversubscribed countries, and retain in the Congress full responsibility for our immigration policy.

Additionally, by bill will immediately: First. Admit parents of U.S. citizens as nonquota immigrants; second, remove the bar to the admission of epileptics since the ailment is now controllable by medication, and, third, overhaul and

consolidate our refugee program permitting the admission of up to 10,000 victims of communism, persecution, and natural calamity, subject to rigid health and security conditions.

After an interim period of 3 years in which distribution of the unused quota numbers will permit clearing up the oversubscribed waiting lists, my bill will set a worldwide quota of 200,000 immigrants annually. The Western Hemisphere, from which some 140,000 were admitted in 1964, will remain nonquota. Without reference to the place of birth, immigrants will be granted visas on a first-come, first-served basis, with first preferences to relatives so that families may be reunited, and then to specially skilled persons whose services are urgently needed in our country. Immigration from any one country will be subject, however, to a maximum annual ceiling of 20,000.

This bill will make our immigration current in short order and provide an orderly system of immigration, free of discrimination, based upon the best interests of the United States.

QUOTABLE QUOTES FROM GOVERNOR BROWN

(Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. GROVER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one of the difficult issues in California at the present time is the farm labor problem caused by the shortsightedness of the Labor Department and the Congress in terminating the bracero program. Governor Brown is on the horns of a dilemma on this issue as he is a stalwart Democrat and therefore adverse to criticize Secretary Wirtz while at the same time mindful of his peculiar State problem.

When the press asked him if he believed Secretary Wirtz was doing a good job handling the farm labor problem, the Governor recently replied:

I think he is doing a good job. Yes, I think it is very difficult. He's doing a different one from the one our department of employment thinks should be done, but it is not easy and he could be right. I think he's wrong but he could be right.

MAXIMUM OF BENEFICIAL TRADE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG], is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. HERLONG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that everyone believes in a maximum of trade; but some of us would qualify this and say that we believe in a maximum of beneficial trade. Not all trade is necessarily beneficial. We have only to think of the traffic in opium to agree that not all trade is good simply because it is trade. Even speaking economically not all trade is necessarily good under all circumstances. Much de-

June 2, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2815

broadcast decisions now pending before the Federal Communications Commission.

That involvement is of special interest in view of the President's recent order prescribing standards of ethical conduct for government officers and employees.

A close reading of the ethics code points up not only the potential conflict inherent in the Presidential family's chief business asset being regulated by a commission whose members are appointed by the President, it also sets up as one code intent that employees—in this case the members of the FCC—"avoid any action . . . which might result in, or create the appearance of . . . giving preferential treatment to any organization or person"—in this case the President. That's a task that, under the circumstances, is difficult to perform.

Though the Johnson stockholdings in Texas Broadcasting Corp. have been placed temporarily in a trust, everyone who deals with the company either in Washington or in Texas is aware of the Presidential interest.

BRIEF REMINDERS

Two quick illustrations come to mind. In a recent telephone call, an Austin woman who participated in the sale of land to a newly formed subsidiary of Texas Broadcasting remarked, "Of course the Johnsons own it indirectly." And for those here in Washington there is the one-paragraph reminder on each of Texas Broadcasting's FCC license renewal forms—"Claudia T. Johnson, stockholder, whose stock is in trust, is also a landholder."

Texas Broadcasting has some interest in each of the three FCC priority issues Commission Chairman E. William Henry presently outlined to a Senate subcommittee.

According to their FCC filings, the Johnson corporation has options to purchase prior to January 28, 1966, up to 50 percent of the stock of Capital Cable Corp., the firm which owns and operates Austin's community antenna television system (CATV). One broadcaster has estimated this option to be worth \$1 million.

Last month, after several years of study, the Commission issued new rules for CATV's that use microwave transmitters, a rulemaking procedure for off-the-air CATV's and an inquiry into other CATV matters. Among those other matters is the question as to whether television station licensees should be permitted to own CATV systems within their own service areas. In addition, the Commission now has before it several cases where a decision may set a policy on this particular issue.

If the FCC rules that television station licensees cannot own CATV's in their areas, Texas Broadcasting's option would be worth nothing. Thus the FCC decision—even the very timing of it—could be worth an estimated \$1 million to the Johnson-owned broadcasting company, depending on if and when it chose to exercise its option.

PROGRAMING ISSUE

The second most pressing FCC business, according to Chairman Henry, is the rulemaking on limitation of network ownership of prime evening programming to 50 percent from the more than 90 percent of today.

The three networks have banded together to fight the proposed rule. They in turn have sought support from their affiliated stations. Recently, in Hollywood, the CBS affiliates organization passed a resolution authorizing steps to be taken to present their opposition to the proposal to the Commission. Among the television stations making up the CBS group is KTBC-TV of Austin, the Johnson-owned station.

The third big issue before the Commission is the question of multiple ownership of television stations. FCC rules now limit an owner to five VHF stations—the number at present controlled in whole or in part by Texas Broadcasting. The Commission re-

cently announced that a hearing would be held on any sale of television property that involved—on either side—the owner of more than 1 station in the top 50 markets.

Though this temporary rule would not automatically require a hearing if the Johnsons sold their broadcast holdings, it does limit the persons or corporations to whom they could sell. Station owners dislike the prospect of an FCC hearing, and for the Johnsons such a necessity—with the possibility that a Republican would intervene—could prove politically embarrassing.

Although the FCC has focused its multiple ownership rule on the top 50 stations, Chairman Henry has told Congress that consideration is being given to changing the rules so as to affect all stations—a move that would bear directly on the Johnson interests.

STATION FINED

Aside from the broad policy issues there are smaller, individual matters that bring the FCC Commissioners directly into contact with the Johnson stations. For example, they recently set a fine of \$1,000 on KNAL, Victoria, Tex., a station in which Texas Broadcasting holds a minority interest. The station was found to have violated several FCC operating rules. KNAL has asked the Commission to set aside the fine, saying the violations have been corrected and "no useful purpose is to be served by assessment of a fine against the licensee."

No matter how they act, the Commissioners will be open to allegations that the Johnson ownership influenced them. This is true whether they drop the fine—as they have done in other cases—or affirm it—possibly just to prove they are not under Presidential influence.

Stories published last year when the Commission ruled on a petition involving Austin CATV systems proved this point.

Capital Cable's competitor asked the Commission to waive its rules to permit it to better compete with the system in which the President's family had an option.

The FCC, following its past decision, turned down the petition and the news stories that followed headlined the action as favorable to the Johnson interests.

The situation is such that the Commission, through no act of its own, is doomed to face continued charges of influence because of the Johnson holdings. The paradox of it all is that to dispose of the holdings—except through distribution in small pieces—almost by necessity would require a public hearing and therefore publicity of a nature that the President most certainly would not find desirable.

The States on Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record I include the following editorial from the Thomasville Times-Enterprise appearing in the May 26 issue. This editorial is factual and timely—it certainly is in concert with the specific thinking that prevails in the Second District of Georgia—namely, "You cannot get something for nothing." I commend this article to those who care about what happens to our freedom and solvency:

[From the Thomasville (Ga.) Times-Enterprise, May 26, 1965]

THE STATES ON WELFARE

By their constant visits to Washington for financial assistance and their continuing dependence upon the Federal Government for handouts it seems the several States are themselves now to be considered as welfare recipients.

There's little difference in the status of the individual and the State, insofar as being the recipient of Federal assistance, except the States get more. The principal is somewhat the same, however, with thousands of communities virtually giving up their autonomous status in order to conform to some Federal regulation as a prerequisite to some grant, loan or outright gift.

It's surprising, in fact, amazing, how rapidly this practice has grown in the past 30 years, when the New Deal began to flower and statehood began to wither. At that time our national debt was only a few billions, less than 30 as we recall. But as rapidly as the Federal Government began moving into the position of a guardian angel for the various States and cities, with handouts of money ranging from a few thousands to many millions of dollars, the debt began to grow.

It all started as an emergency aid to meet the conditions of the depression era. Legislation of many kinds was passed at the request of the President (F. D. Roosevelt) to make possible all the new gifts from the great Croesus who ruled in Washington. Many of the measures were classified as temporary, and a servile Congress acting as a great rubber stamp passed virtually any bill presented to it. That was their answer to the alarming situation caused by the depression. It was equivalent to the call of volunteer firemen to come and help at a neighborhood blaze.

But instead of going back home after the fire had been extinguished, the number of firemen in Washington began to grow by leaps and bounds, and they began to cook up all kinds of schemes to help the people, as they said. With each handout, however, they sent a regulation or passed a new law to give authority to them, to require local compliance.

From a little trickle of Federal aid in the beginning to the floodtide of Federal assistance in 1965, the thing we call Federal aid has grown by leaps and bounds. So great has become the trend to send help into communities, that from time to time we hear of Federal aid being sent into an area, whether requested or not. Emergency help for so-called stricken areas has become the order of the day. Progressively it has now brought us to the flowering of the antipoverty program, which will involve the expenditure of hundreds of millions, even billions of dollars.

Now, our welfare rolls over the Nation have reached astronomic proportions with millions of people receiving help from Washington. At the same time, our States, cities, and counties look to Washington for the answer to virtually every problem, especially in matters of finance.

And it should be remembered that many of the emergency laws enacted in the early thirties are still operative, and the controls that were imposed under this or that regulation then have persisted and in many cases have been broadened and tightened, the tentacles of bureaucratic control now reaching into every phase of life.

Out of all this has come a weakening of the public will to do for itself that which is asked of Washington, and with each new grant, loan, or gift from Washington more local independence is surrendered.

Now we have a national debt of over \$315 billion, and we have become so accustomed to deficit financing (another depression era product) that no one gives a second thought to payment of the big debt or an end to the

A2816

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 2, 1965

practice of spending money the Government doesn't have. And as the demand on Washington grows with the two political parties vying one with another to see how much of your money they can give away in exchange for your vote and surrender to the welfare state, we find that as our inflated dollars grow bigger and more numerous in volume, they are dwarfed and shrunken in purchasing power.

Future historians will very likely look back upon this era of the Great Society as also the era in which free spending and deficit financing made this a sort of "fool's paradise."

Needed Immigration Changes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following letter in the Gary, Ind., Post Tribune, May 22, 1965, authored by Miss Elizabeth N. Wilson, executive director of the International Institute of Gary, Indiana, Inc., sets out some very important and essential facts regarding the pending legislation on immigration changes which the Congress will consider in the near future. I would hope that this session will bring about an equitable and long delayed change in our quota system and other practical and fairer methods of admitting future Americans within our borders.

The letter follows:

[From the Gary (Ind.) Post Tribune, May 22, 1965]

OUR "ANTI-GREEK" LAW

We will have the great privilege of watching a live broadcast from Greece on the "Today Show" on channel 5 from 7 to 9 a.m. next week. We will see the glories of ancient and modern Greece.

American tourists have discovered Greece during the past 10 years and it is said to be the most popular country for tourists today. Greece will be crowded during August as over 7,000 American citizens of Greek birth or background will attend 2 international Greek conventions, the AHEPA (American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association) in Athens and the Pan Arcadian in Tripoli, Peloponnese, Greece.

All Americans visiting Greece this year and all those who wish they could, should be embarrassed and indeed apologetic to the Greek people that the United States still has a law discriminating against them—our immigration law. Out of a total quota of 165,000 numbers, the Greek people are assigned 308 numbers. The British are assigned 65,361 numbers, the Germans 25,314, and the Irish 17,756, a total of 109,931 numbers or 70 percent for these three "Nordic" nations.

Worse still, many of these numbers go unused and cannot be transferred to Greece and the other small quota countries. Two-thirds of the huge British and Irish quotas are wasted each year and the German quota has long been current.

Underlying this most discriminatory legislation of our country is the assumption that the Greek people are inferior to the British, German, and Irish. Does anyone in this country believe this any more, if they ever did?

While communing with Greece this coming week let us all think of this legislation which

prevents uniting of families. What can we do? Write to our Senators endorsing the Hart bill S. 500 and to our Congressman endorsing the Celler bill H.R. 2580. These are administration-sponsored bills which would provide a different plan for handling immigration without greatly increasing the number of immigrants. The national origins quota system under which immigrants are selected first by country of birth would gradually be eliminated.

ELIZABETH WILSON.

The Enemy Is Apathy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in a hard-hitting speech entitled, "The Enemy Is Apathy," Adm. John M. Will—retired—has taken a long look at what is happening to the American maritime industry and came up with some suggestions which should be of immediate concern to all of us.

The admiral is the chairman of the board of the American Export Isbrandtsen Lines, Inc. In the best tradition of straight-spoken naval officers, he outlines the problem facing this country's merchant fleet—a problem we ourselves are responsible for.

This matter is of vital importance to the welfare of our Nation, for we have sat idly by while other nations developed modern merchant fleets. The admiral points to past examples of American industrial and commercial genius and asks, in effect, "What is happening?"

The text of his remarks follow:

EXCERPTS FROM "THE ENEMY IS APATHY"
(An address by Adm. John M. Will, chairman of the board, American Export Isbrandtsen Lines, Inc., at the Maritime Week luncheon of the Ocean Freight Agents Association of Chicago, May 17, 1965)

Since those splendid days when proud Yankee clipper ships dominated the seas and gained for themselves a near monopoly of the world's ocean cargoes, the American merchant marine has been shipping water badly. Except for the frenetic activities of wartime, U.S. merchant ships have been sailing on an ever-ebbing tide.

Today, far from the lion of yesterday, the mouse of American scheduled freighter services carries only about one-quarter of the foreign trade tonnage entering or leaving U.S. ports. In nonlinear bulk commercial commerce, the appalling figure is less than 5 percent.

The picture grows more dismal each year, yet the means are at hand right now to reverse this ebbing tide and to catapult the American merchant marine back onto the cresting tide of world commerce.

The means for this dramatic reversal lie in high speed ships powered by nuclear energy. This is neither a fuzzy concept nor a "maybe someday" proposition. The nuclear ship *Savannah* has proved beyond all doubt that the power of the atom is a practical, viable power source for the merchant marine.

Yet, despite our preeminence in the field of nuclear propulsion—despite the incontestable fact that nuclear power offers the only immediately available opportunity for a major breakthrough in marine engineering—we

have thus far failed to exploit this chance which is so singularly ours.

We have failed to move forward because we are heeding the cost-conscious cautioners who say nuclear power is not economically feasible. This form of pennywise, pound-foolish reasoning may be of some comfort to comptrollers and accountants, but it is hardly in the American tradition of "can do" and "will do."

At the time of their inception, neither the locomotive nor the automobile nor the airplane were "economically feasible." The first locomotive tore along at 10 miles an hour, the first automobile coughed and sputtered to achieve 4 miles an hour, and Orville Wright's first biplane hung precariously off the ground for 12 seconds to make good a forward speed of about 7 miles an hour. By what rules of economics were these prototypes feasible?

Yet, contrast the progress of these vehicles, none of them suitable for massive over-ocean commerce, with the progress of the steamship. Today's most efficient freighter moves fully loaded at a maximum of 21 knots, a scant four times faster than Mr. Fulton's *Clermont*.

The nuclear ship *Savannah* is capable of 23 knots and the nuclear-powered aircraft carrier U.S.S. *Enterprise* is rated at more than 30 knots. We can apply the same propulsion principles which have been proven in these two ships to a fleet of 30-knot freighters which would place us immediately in a strongly competitive position for world trade. Still, we, as a nation, sit back and say, "It is not economically feasible."

If we wait for further developments from the drawing boards, or if we defer our nuclear building program while we "prove out" on shorebased prototypes an already proven propulsion system, we may as well file and forget our hopes for a nuclear merchant fleet.

Then, perhaps, we can send our engineers and technicians to West Germany where they can observe and report while the Germans install an American-built reactor directly into a new hull. Then, perhaps, we can wait yet another year or so until the Japanese are ready to demonstrate this same technique.

In the meanwhile, we can conveniently ignore the 68 marine reactors now in actual operation in naval vessels at sea—we can brush aside the fact that 54 more are being readied for seagoing operations—and we can assure the Bureau of the Budget that it is not important that only one of these reactors, the one already in the *Savannah*, is available for use in the American merchant marine.

Even further, perhaps we should hold to the narcotic notion that maritime reactors are, indeed, not economically feasible and surrender by default our chance to reestablish the American merchant marine as an integral and important part of our national economy.

If this is the answer, then we must also be prepared to retire the American eagle in favor of the ostrich and wait, with our heads complacently in the sands, until we can safely and "feasibly" buy nuclear-propelled merchant ships from the Germans or the Japanese—or the Russians.

Silver Year of a Bishop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, a special Mass will be celebrated tomorrow at the

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000100040001-6

and supplies in return for the payment of fees, wristwatches and other essential articles and use their roommates books or books from institutional libraries as was done under the World War II GI bills. In other words, it could lead to subterfuge for getting a Government handout; (5) tax credits for higher education would be a means of getting tax money into institutions without their being subject to the provision of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 regarding racial discrimination. This is opening up another form of subterfuge of getting tax money illegally; (6) a number of advocates of the tax credit scheme have publicly stated that a substantial portion of the tax credit moneys would be recaptured by institutions by tuition increases. If this were so, and I think it would be, it would be of little or no help to the taxpayer, but would be an indirect route for helping institutions of higher learning with Federal funds, but without Federal control; (7) the Senate bill 12 would provide for greater benefits to persons choosing to send their children to expensive schools than to persons sending their children to inexpensive schools. This is another form of discrimination against those in the lower income bracket.

In 1962, 72 percent of the 5.8 million families with adjusted gross income of less than \$3,000 paid no Federal income taxes. Some 5.5 million of the 12.8 million families with adjusted gross incomes of less than \$5,000, or 42 percent, paid no income taxes. The tax credit proposal would be of no assistance to these people. It might, in fact, be harmful in that the loss of moneys to the Federal Treasury might cut down the amount of scholarships and other aids which the Federal Government is presently providing for the lower income family;

(8) The first year cost of Senate bill 12 to the Treasury is estimated at \$1 billion. This is 4 times the administration's "higher education package" as proposed for the current year and also 4 times the annual Federal contribution to the academic facilities program on an annual basis. The cost of Senate bill 12 would rise to \$1.3 billion by the third year of its operation. The amount of money required by Senate bill 12 could be much better applied through other means outlined below.

In summary, I believe that tax credits for higher education expenses would be of little or no help to the lower income families who most need assistance. Such legislation would discriminate in favor of the families with better than average incomes which, in my view, is antisocial legislation.

You quite properly ask for alternative proposals if I do not favor the tax credit plan. I am convinced that public-operated community colleges must be established, where as in Connecticut they do not exist, and expanded in States where such institutions have already been established. I would suggest that much more Federal funds be made available for community and junior colleges. There is, I understand, presently before Congress, a new series of higher education proposals, for aiding students to meet college costs. I urge your support of these worthy proposals. I refer to the:

- (a) Opportunity grants of up to \$800 to help needy and worthy students of college ability get through college;
- (b) Expansion of the work-study program;
- (c) Expansion of the Federal loan program.

I would also urge passage of the cold war GI bill of rights.

The college academic facilities grant program should be continued, but revised to provide for raising the Federal share from 33 percent for degree granting institutions to 75 percent. This would enable the private institutions to expand to accommodate a larger percentage of the burden.

I strongly urge that Federal legislation be passed which would put part of the burden

on the Federal Government instead of letting it subsidize the Federal Treasury as at present. Housing in public-supported institutions is a greater financial burden than tuition and books. I understand that a reduction of 2 percent in the college housing loan rate would cut the carrying charge by \$120 a year or \$13 a month based on 9 months occupancy. This is one way of reducing room charge for thousands of students at modest cost to the Government. I favor such governmental assistance.

Pressure on tuition raises could, and I believe would, be eased by a reduction of matching provisions on ongoing programs. I urge such reductions.

Administrative machinery is already available for these alternatives. I have proposed none which would discriminate against any group in our society. All would reduce, or slow down rising college costs.

I urge that your task force think long and hard before supporting the tax credits program.

I have endeavored to suggest alternatives. I appeal for your support for these and similar kinds of legislations.

Thank you kindly for inviting me to express my views.

Sincerely yours,

MERLIN D. BISHOP,
Subregional Director.

ST. JOHN COLLEGE OF CLEVELAND,
Cleveland, Ohio, May 20, 1965.

Mr. ALBERT H. QUIE,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. QUIE: I appreciate your letter of May 17, with its announcement of your inquiry into the question of tax credits as a means of helping offset the increasing costs of higher education. It is an incontrovertible fact that the numbers of college students will be greatly increasing in the coming decades. It is equally beyond question that the costs of higher education will be rapidly increasing. A third equally obvious fact is that the best interest of our Nation requires that every qualified student have the opportunity to develop his talents to their greatest potential. Any failure in this regard will deprive our Nation of a significant contribution to its economical, social, and cultural growth.

In order to meet the growing challenge in higher education, every possible resource must be used to its fullest potential. There is no other way that the task can be satisfactorily completed. The cost is great but the price of any significant failure in this regard is far greater.

It is my conviction that the tax credit plan does not begin to level up to the massive proportions of the job ahead. The critical urgency of the job of higher education requires action in a much wider dimension.

Sincerely yours,

Rt. Rev. Msgr. LAWRENCE P. CAHILL,
President.

KENDALL,
Boston, Mass., May 20, 1965.

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN QUIE: First, I want to congratulate you and your task force on the manner and thoroughness of your study of the ways and means of meeting the rising costs of higher education. This is already a very serious problem and one for which I see no relief in sight based on my service and experience as a trustee and treasurer of Wheaton College in Norton, Mass., and as a trustee of Brown University. Projecting the trends of recent years, I anticipate that these costs of advanced education will continue to

escalate at an annual rate of 4 to 5 percent, with the result that by 1970 the total cost per student for tuition, room and board at our leading private institutions will be approaching \$4,000 per two-semester terms. Clearly if we are to maintain our national preeminence in education that is essential for our survival, we need more bold and imaginative approaches to the financing of these costs than have so far been developed.

Having stated this broad endorsement of your studies, however, I cannot support the proposal to provide tax credits as a means of helping to offset these increasing costs. My criticism is the same as that of the U.S. Treasury; namely, that such a proposal would be a significant step in reducing the base of taxable income, whereas the objective should be to maintain or increase the base while reducing the ratio of taxation on personal income. The proposal is also an indiscriminate method of financial assistance even when the amount of tax relief is graduated according to various income levels. Finally, it is one more step that makes taxation an instrument of national policy rather than fulfilling its main purpose of raising revenue.

As you know, our colleges and universities are well equipped to evaluate the needs for assistance to students and their parents in financing the costs of higher education. What they lack are the resources to fill those needs. Even though great efforts are being made to raise funds by private contributions and the like to increase these resources, these efforts are almost certain to be inadequate without Federal Government support. The need is for greatly increased grants for loans, scholarship, student self-help, and the like. Thus the step taken by the House Education and Labor Committee earlier this week to double the funding of the aid to education program by providing a variety of help to institutions and students is a good step in this direction.

In this type of program of providing resources to meet the needs, I wish it were possible to provide extra incentive to those who would help themselves, perhaps along the lines of the matching grant programs of the large foundations and the growing number of corporate gift matching plans. These are sound, they stimulate incentive, and they are increasingly effective, but it is doubtful if private funds can do the job that needs to be done. Thus if the Federal Government could offer to match efforts of a college to increase scholarship and other financial aid in the same manner that it now can offer a grant toward a new science building, the college would have tremendous incentive to raise such funds from private sources and its effectiveness in doing this would be greatly enhanced.

With all best wishes for your success in developing a sound and far-reaching program.

Sincerely,

M. L. CLEMENCE.

SELECTIVE IMMIGRATION SYSTEM WITH QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE CONTROLS

THE SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I introduced a bill H.R. 8662 to establish a new selective immigration system, with qualitative and quantitative controls consistent with our domestic needs and our international commitments.

As is known, the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality has conducted extensive and searching inquiries

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000100040001-6

on pending immigration legislation during the past 12 months. Testimony was taken from the Secretary of State, two Attorney Generals, the Secretary of Labor, and the U.S. Public Health Service expressing the position of the administration on the basic issues involved. Members of Congress have appeared personally or submitted statements expressing their views on the issues.

We have heard witnesses speaking in behalf of the major religious faiths, the AFL-CIO, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Veterans Committee, the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, the Steuben Society, Ahepa, the Polish-American Congress, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, American Committee for Italian Migration, Estonian Aid Society, American Committee for Croatian Migration, the National Committee for Refugees, the Civil Liberties Union, the Order of the Sons of Italy, the Greenwich Women's Republican Club, the National Economic Council, the Liberty League, the Republican Club of 100, Inc., and many others, as may be seen from the list of such witnesses which I will include in my remarks.

It is fair to say that our subcommittee has heard every color and shade of opinion—both pro and con—on every major issue involved in this legislation.

It has been my privilege to Chair these hearings and to have the benefit of the probative questioning by the members of the subcommittee. I can state without qualification that these hearings have been completely objective and non-partisan so far as the members of the subcommittee are concerned. We sought nothing more than the facts but all the facts with respect to every issue involved.

These hearings have established one central fact beyond any doubt; that our present method of immigrant admissions, involving several systems, is inadequate, misleading, and in need of immediate revision. We have reached a point in our national development where a selective system of immigrant admissions with qualitative and quantitative controls fixed by law cannot be avoided. The bill which I introduced today calls for such a selective immigration system.

The national origins quota system has been made the major issue in the hearings before our subcommittee. The claim has been made that the national origins quota system regulates immigration into the United States. That claim cannot be supported with facts. The official record shows that over the past 10 years quota immigration accounts for no more than one-third of our annual immigrant admissions. The remaining two-thirds are admitted as nonquota immigrants.

When the national origins quota system was enacted into law more than 40 years ago, provision was also made for nonquota status for natives of the independent countries of the Western Hemisphere. This provided two systems of immigrant admissions, one the quota system and the other the non-quota system.

The quota system fixed a ceiling on the number of immigrants we would ad-

mit each year from any country outside the Western Hemisphere, based upon a percentage of the number of people in the United States whose origin was traceable to such foreign country according to the 1920 national census. The nonquota system had no numerical limitations or restrictions of any type.

What results have these systems produced? By 1949, 25 years after these two systems were enacted into law, we find that nonquota immigration had equalled quota immigration. In the course of 15 years, between 1949 and 1964, nonquota immigration has doubled quota immigration.

What the ratio will be in 5 or 10 years hence is a matter of speculation, but I am certain that nonquota immigration will continue to increase over quota immigration unless Congress takes corrective action. This trend is inevitable because of the introduction of the non-quota concepts to the quota countries external to the Western Hemisphere. Special public legislation granting non-quota status to classes of aliens in the quota countries has made a myth of the national origins quota system.

Since enactment of the Immigration and Nationality Act in 1952, there have been no less than 10 amendments to the law authorizing immigrant admissions outside the quota system. As a consequence the mathematical quota set for many countries has little relation to the number of immigrants we actually admit from those countries. Here are a few comparisons between the annual quota set by law and the annual average number of immigrants admitted over the past 10 years:

Greece: Quota is 308 per year; actually admitted, 2,666 per year.

Italy: Quota is 5,666 per year; actually admitted, 15,685 per year.

Spain: Quota is 250 per year; actually admitted, 1,264 per year.

Portugal: Quota is 433 per year; actually admitted, 2,736 per year.

Japan: Quota is 185 per year; actually admitted, 4,887 per year.

Philippines: Quota is 100 per year; actually admitted, 2,281 per year.

Korea: Quota is 100 per year; actually admitted 1,250 per year.

Indonesia: Quota is 100 per year; actually admitted 1,657 per year.

It is evident, therefore, that the national origins quota system no longer controls the number of immigrants we admit each year from countries external to the Western Hemisphere.

Another popular misunderstanding is that the annual quota ceiling set by law determines the total number of immigrants authorized for admission each year. The quota limit is 158,361 per year. Over the past 10 years we have admitted approximately 300,000 immigrants each year. Ironically, quota immigrants have averaged no more than 95,000 a year during that period.

In more recent years we have added a third system of immigrant admissions which applies only to refugees and is called the parole system. That system has two major phases, the so-called fair share refugee program and the Hong Kong refugee program.

It has been proposed that this third system of refugee admissions be expanded. Where this would lead is a matter of speculation as well as concern because testimony on this proposal has been both confusing and inconclusive. For these reasons I am advocating immediate and outright repeal of the national origins quota system together with repeal of nonquota status for natives of countries external to the Western Hemisphere and repeal of the system of paroling refugees into the United States.

To replace those systems I propose a fixed ceiling of 225,000 immigrant admissions per year from all former quota countries and for all purposes. A maximum ceiling of 20,000 a year for any one country is proposed, exempting from that country ceiling only the husbands, wives, children, fathers, and mothers of U.S. citizens.

Natives of the independent countries of the Western Hemisphere would continue in their present status, that is, no numerical limitations or restrictions are proposed on the number of immigrants we will admit from those countries.

I have advocated simultaneous repeal of both the national origins quota system and all nonquota provisions of law. I have done so because accident of country of birth is the common denominator of judgment for both the quota system and nonquota system as it applies to natives of the Western Hemisphere. It remains my belief that if we are to remove accident of country of birth as a penalty for some, we should remove it where it serves as a privilege for others.

This is necessary, in my judgment, if we are to forge a new immigration system which extends equal treatment to all the nations of the world. However, I am advised by appropriate Government spokesmen that repeal of the special nonquota status for natives of the independent countries of the Western Hemisphere is unacceptable at this time.

The selective immigration program I propose, within the total ceiling and the single country ceiling, would be governed by seven preference classes of immigrants. First preference is given, without any limit on the numbers, to spouses, children, and parents of U.S. citizens. The immediate members of families of U.S. citizens would not have to wait 1 day to be admitted to the United States under this provision. The numbers which will remain after the first preference is satisfied will be available to the following six classes, in the percentages indicated:

Second preference, 10 percent to members of the professions and scientists and persons with skill and talent in the visual and performing arts.

Third preference, 20 percent to spouses, children, and parents of aliens who have previously been admitted for permanent residence but who have not yet become citizens.

Fourth preference, 20 percent to married sons and daughters of U.S. citizens.

Fifth preference, 20 percent to brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens.

Sixth preference, 20 percent to persons with skills which are found by the

Secretary of Labor to be Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000100040001-6

in short supply in this country.
Seventh preference, 10 percent to refugees from Communist tyranny and oppression with a proviso that up to one-half of this number may be used by persons who have been offered a temporary refuge in this country upon a finding that they are unable or unwilling to return to their homelands because of persecution or fear thereof, and only after 2 years residence in this country.

As an additional precaution to guarantee the inviolability of family unity and to prevent harmful interpretations of law by overzealous bureaucrats, I propose that any immigrant authorized to come to the United States has an absolute right to bring his wife and children, otherwise qualified, with him.

Only after the above preferences have been satisfied will visa numbers which remain be made available on a first-come, first-served order of registration to nonpreference applicants on a worldwide basis.

Within this nonpreference class there is created a reserve, under the direct control of the President, by which he may reallocate up to one-half the available numbers to nationals of countries who may be adversely affected by the immediate termination of the national origins quota system.

For example, in Germany and the United Kingdom where the largest quota allocations are available, there has been no occasion or opportunity for desiring immigrants to register on a consular waiting list as was necessary for thousands of nationals of countries with heavily oversubscribed quotas.

Consequently, in a worldwide competition for nonpreference numbers, such nationals may be unfairly disadvantaged particularly in the years immediately following the passage of the bill.

The President's reserve would also be available to increase the number of refugees who could be admitted should a sudden, abnormal refugee situation occur, such as arose in Austria after the 1956 unsuccessful revolt of the Hungarian freedom fighters, or to take care of disaster situations such as occurred in the Azores in 1957 which necessitated special legislation to authorize admission of a number of its victims.

Other proposed revisions of the law are:

Added protection for American workers by strengthening authority of the Secretary of Labor to make determinations on the specific skills, crafts, and special occupational talents in short supply, and for which there are no able or willing workers in the United States. These added safeguards would apply to all sixth preference and all nonpreference immigrants.

Epilepsy would be removed from the mandatorily excludable classes of immigrants. Medical science has demonstrated that epilepsy is not contagious and that it is controllable by medication and medical treatment.

An "eligible orphan" is redefined by consolidating three sections of the present law which have caused confusion in determining eligibility.

countries behind the Iron Curtain demonstrate fear of "physical" persecution in order to stay deportation is removed.

Removal of the term "physical" recognizes that the more subtle, mental, moral, and emotional sanctions imposed upon the captive citizens by totalitarian regimes are no less a basis for our refusal to return these people to their native lands and to such oppressions.

Alien crewmen are accorded the same treatment as all other aliens under suspension of deportation proceedings, and under certain conditions adjustment of status procedure.

Any alien who entered the United States prior to December 24, 1952, who has resided here since and is of good character may be granted the status of a permanent resident. This has the effect of a limited statute of limitation against deportation.

To summarize, these would be the major outcomes of the selective immigration program I have proposed:

First. All present first, second, third, and fourth preference waiting lists would be wiped out during the first year of operations. The only exception is the fourth preference waiting list in Italy which is now in excess of 100,000 and that will take more time to satisfy.

Second. Immediate family members of U.S. citizens will not have to wait 1 day after the effective date of the bill to enter the United States.

Third. Future immigration to the United States will no longer tolerate split families because of peculiarities of the law.

Fourth. Refugees will not carry the stigma of parole as a condition of their entry and there would be only one refugee program under control of U.S. officials from start to finish.

Fifth. Professional persons and persons with skills and talents for which there is a demonstrated need in the United States will be able without delay to enter as immigrants.

Sixth. The authority given directly to the President to meet emergencies, within the available number of nonpreference immigrant visas, will make unnecessary emergency or special immigration legislation in the future.

Seventh. The number of private immigration bills before Congress should shrink to manageable proportions and should consist of only very unusual cases.

Eighth. Congress will have taken a very large step in the direction of regaining and maintaining its authority for regulating immigration into the United States.

The list of witnesses is as follows:

LIST OF WITNESSES

American Legion: Dr. Daniel J. O'Connor and Mr. Clarence Olsen.
National Association of Evangelicals: Mr. Robert A. Cook.
Order of AHEPA: Mr. Gregory Lagakos.
American Committee on Italian Migration: Hon. Juvenal Marchisio.
Doorstep Savannah, Inc.: Mrs. Rosalind Frame.
National Economic Council, Inc.: Mr. Mark M. Jones.
Nationalities Service Center of Cleveland: Mr. John Papandreas.

AFL-CIO: Mr. Kenneth A. Maiklejohn.
American Council on Nationalities Service: Miss Edith Lowenstein.
Industrial Union Division (AFL-CIO): Mr. James Carey.

Daughters of the American Revolution: Mrs. Robert V. H. Duncan.

National Jewish organizations listed in statement: Mr. Murray I. Gurfein and Mr. James P. Rice.

Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States: Mr. Francis W. Stover.

Lutheran Immigration Service: Mr. Donald E. Anderson.

Danube-Swabian Association of America, Inc.: Mr. Anton K. Rumpf.

Council for Individual Freedom: Mr. Charles A. McCarthy.

New Jersey Coalition: Mrs. Ralph D. Hacker.

Church World Service, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.: Mr. John Schauer.

Friends Committee on National Legislation: Mr. Richard Smith.

Bible Baptist Church: Rev. Cecil A. Hodges.

American Coalition of Patriotic Societies: Mr. John B. Trevor, Jr.

American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service: Bishop Edward Swanson.

American Committee for Croatian Migration, Inc.: Mr. Joseph V. Bosiljevic, president.

Greenwich Women's Republican Club: Mrs. Alice Alesandroni, Mrs. Eleanor Gonzalez.

Order Sons of Italy in America: Mr. John Ottaviano, Jr., Mr. Joseph A. L. Errigo, Mr. Samuel A. Culotta, and Dr. Nicholas M. Petruzzelli.

National Chinese Welfare Council: Mr. Jack Wong Sing.

Liberty Lobby: Mr. W. B. Hicks, Jr.

Northern New Jersey Immigration Conference: Mrs. Arthur Hawkins.

Association of Immigration & Nationality Lawyers: Mr. Edward Dubroff.

The American Public Health Association, Inc.: Dr. Paul Harper.

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom: Mrs. Selma Samole.

Japanese American Citizens League: Mr. Mike Masaoka.

Organization for Preservation of Samoan Democracy: Mr. Galumalemana Vainupo Alailima.

John E. McCarthy, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Dr. James Read, President, Wilmington College, Friends Committee on National Legislation.

Mr. Karl Speiss, Sr., Homeowners Federation of Arlington.

Dr. Filindo B. Masino, American Institute for Italian Culture and Philadelphia Bar Association.

Frank Weill, American Veterans Committee.

Jeanne E. Kerbs, Republican Committee of One Hundred, Inc.

Andrew Blumiller, AFL-CIO legislative director, legislation department.

Walter T. Darmopray, Esq., Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc.

Nicholas S. Limperis, national chairman, AHEPA immigration legislation committee, Order of AHEPA.

James H. Sheldon, United Church of Christ, Council for Christian Social Action.

George A. Maxwell, M.D.

Miss Lorna Logan, Greater Chinatown Civil Association of San Francisco.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I would be very happy to yield to my distinguished and able colleague from the great State of Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, the people of Hawaii are very much interested in this area of immigration and I have from time to time voiced that interest on behalf of the people of Hawaii to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration. I have been very much interested in the explanation of the bill which the gentleman has introduced, but there is one question which I would like to put to the gentleman in the well: What is the major difference between the gentleman's bill and the Celler bill?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Well, first, my bill calls for immediate repeal of the national origins quota system. The Celler bill stretches repeal out over a 5-year period.

Second, my bill calls for an annual ceiling of 225,000 immigrant admissions from countries external to the Western Hemisphere. The Celler bill has no ceiling set by law.

Third, my bill calls for a ceiling of 20,000 a year from any one country, exempting spouses, children, and parents of U.S. citizens from that country's ceiling.

The Celler bill would set an annual ceiling of 16,600 on any one country at the end of 5 years.

Also, my bill changes the order of and enlarges the number of preference classes. Immediate family members of U.S. citizens are given first preference without numerical limitation.

A new preference class is created for professional persons and persons with unusual skills and talents in the visual and performing arts. A new preference class is created for victims of Communist persecution, which repeals the practice of paroling refugees into the United States.

The present fourth preference is divided into two new preference classes.

The Celler bill perpetuates the present four preferences in the law, keeping skilled workers as first preference and allotting to that preference a 50-percent first call on all authorized visas. Under my bill direct authority is given to the President to use up to 50 percent of the visa numbers not used by the preference classes to remedy any hardships which may fall upon countries as a consequence of immediate repeal of the national origins quota system, and in order to meet refugee emergencies or natural calamities, should they occur, and the President determines action should be taken to assist some of the victims.

The Celler bill calls for a 7-member immigration board to advise the President on the use of a 30-percent reserve of the total immigrant visas authorized to remedy hardships as a consequence of the gradual repeal of the national origins quota system over a 5-year period. Also, it provides for the use of a 10-percent reserve to meet refugee emergencies and natural calamities.

Further, my bill calls for new safeguards for American workers by strengthening control of the Secretary of Labor on nonpreference immigration. That appears in section 203, subsection 8, of the bill which I introduced, H.R. 8662.

This means that the Secretary of Labor must make an affirmative finding that the jobs that nonpreference immigrants will take in the United States will not deprive any American worker of those jobs. The Celler bill provides no such safeguards for American workers.

My bill also would wire out in the first year all waiting lists in the four preference classes of the present law. The only exception would be the fourth preference waiting list in Italy, which is in excess of 100,000. The Celler bill cannot make this claim.

Those are the major changes.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman for his exhaustive explanation, and I assure the gentleman, although I am a conintroducer of the Celler bill, I will make a very careful study of the bill which the gentleman has introduced.

Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes, I am happy to yield.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. What, if any, indication has the administration given as to its attitude toward the gentleman's bill?

Mr. FEIGHAN. There is no disagreement between the President and me on the principles of the bill which I have introduced.

I have had several long conferences with the President in which we examined at length the full-range problems involved in immigration.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman. I hope that we can take the fact the gentleman has introduced a bill as an indication of speedy action on this most emergent bill in order to raise the image of America throughout the world.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I agree with the gentleman. I believe this is a very sound, fair bill, the most practical bill that has been introduced, even though I am the author, and I hope and will work for speedy enactment.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman again.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I appreciate the keen interest expressed by my colleague and good friend, the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. Speaker, the text of my bill H.R. 8662, and a section-by-section analysis follow:

H.R. 8662

A bill to establish a selective immigration system and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter I of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175; 8 U.S.C. 1151.) be amended as follows:

"CHAPTER I—SELECTIVE IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

"SEC. 201. Exclusive of special immigrants defined in section 101(a) (27), the number of aliens who may be issued immigrant visas or who may otherwise acquire the status of an alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence shall not in any fiscal year exceed 225,000 of which not more than 60,000 may be authorized in each of the first three quarters of such fiscal year.

"SEC. 202. No person shall receive any preference or priority in the issuance of an immigrant visa because of his race, sex, nationality, place of birth, or place of residence,

except as specifically provided in section 101(a) (27) and in section 203: *Provided*, That the total number of immigrant visas available to citizens or nationals of any foreign state under paragraphs (2) through (8) of section 203(a) shall not exceed 20,000.

"SEC. 203. (a) Immigrant visas shall be allotted in each fiscal year as follows:

"(1) Without numerical or percentage limitation, immigrant visas shall be first made available to qualified immigrants who are the husbands, wives, children, unmarried sons or unmarried daughters of a citizen of the United States, or who are the fathers or mothers of a citizen of the United States, such citizen being over twenty-one years of age.

"(2) The first ten per centum of the number of immigrant visas not required for the issuance of immigrant visas to the classes specified in paragraph (1) shall be made available for the issuance of immigrant visas to qualified immigrants who are members of the professions, or who because of their exceptional ability in the sciences or the arts will substantially benefit prospectively the national economy, cultural interests, or welfare of the United States.

"(3) The next twenty per centum of the number of immigrant visas not required for the issuance of immigrant visas to the classes specified in paragraph (1) shall be made available for the issuance of immigrant visas to qualified immigrants who are the husbands, wives, unmarried sons or unmarried daughters of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or who are the fathers or mothers of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, such alien being over twenty-one years of age.

"(4) The next twenty per centum of the number of immigrant visas not required for the issuance of immigrant visas to the classes specified in paragraph (1) shall be made available to qualified immigrants who are the married sons or the married daughters of citizens of the United States.

"(5) The next twenty per centum of the number of immigrant visas not required for the issuance of immigrant visas to the classes specified in paragraph (1) shall be made available to qualified immigrants who are the brothers or sisters of citizens of the United States.

"(6) The next twenty per centum of the number of immigrant visas not required for the issuance of immigrant visas to the classes specified in paragraph (1) shall be made available to qualified immigrants who are capable of performing specified skilled or unskilled labor, not of a temporary or seasonal nature, for which a shortage of employable and willing persons exists in the United States.

"(7) The next 10 per centum of the number of immigrant visas not required for the issuance of immigrant visas to the classes specified in paragraph (1) shall be made available to a qualified immigrant who is or was last a national or resident of any Communist or Communist-dominated country, and is out of his usual place of abode, and who satisfies an Immigration and Naturalization Service officer at an examination in any non-Communist or non-Communist dominated country, prior to visa issuance, that he has fled from his usual place of abode, or is unable or unwilling to return to such usual place of abode, because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion: *Provided*, That not more than one-half the number of immigrant visas specified in this paragraph may be made available to aliens who have been continuously physically present in the United States for a period of two years prior to application.

"(8) Any immigrant visas not required for the issuance of immigrant visas to the classes specified in paragraphs (1) through (7) shall be made available to qualified immigrants

strictly in the chronological order in which such immigrants are registered. The lists which shall be maintained in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State. No immigrant visa shall be issued to a nonpreference immigrant under this subsection until the consular officer is in receipt of a determination made by the Secretary of Labor, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Labor, that the provisions of section 212(a)(14) will not be invoked.

"(9) A spouse or child as defined in section 101(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), or (E) shall, if not otherwise entitled to an immigrant status and the immediate issuance of a visa under paragraphs (1) through (8), be entitled to the same preference or nonpreference status, and the same order of consideration provided in subsection (b), of his accompanying spouse or parent.

"(10) During the fourth quarter of any fiscal year, immigrant visas not required for the issuance of visas to qualified immigrants specified in paragraphs (2) through (5) may, without regard to per centum limitations, be made available cumulatively, to qualified immigrants, in each of the next succeeding classes in paragraphs (3) through (6).

"(11) Not exceeding 50 per centum of the numbers allocated to nonpreference immigrants under paragraph (8), may, on the advice of the Secretary of State, be reserved by the President, without regard to the 20,000 limitation contained in section 202, for allocation to (A) otherwise qualified immigrants whose admission is determined by him to be required to avoid undue hardship, resulting from the abolition of annual quotas and nonquota classes, or to (B) otherwise qualified preference immigrants described in paragraph (7) whose admission is determined by him to be required to further the traditional policy of the United States of offering refuge to persons oppressed or persecuted or (C) otherwise qualified immigrants uprooted by natural calamity or military operations who are unable to return to their usual place of abode.

"(b) Immigrant visas issued pursuant to paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (a) shall be issued to eligible immigrants in the order in which a petition in behalf of each such immigrant is filed with the Attorney General as provided in section 204.

"(c) In considering applications for immigration visas under subsection (a) consideration shall be given first to applicants under paragraph (1) and consideration shall be given to other applicants in the order in which the classes of which they are members are listed in subsection (a).

"(d) Every immigrant shall be presumed to be a nonpreference immigrant until he establishes to the satisfaction of the consular officer and the immigration officer that he is entitled to a preference status under paragraphs (1) through (7) of subsection 203(a)(2), or any United States under section 101(a)(27). In the case of any alien claiming in his application for an immigrant visa to be entitled to preference immigrant status, the consular officer shall not grant such status until he has been authorized to do so as provided in section 204.

"Sec. 204. (a) Any citizen of the United States claiming that an alien is entitled to a preference status by reason of the relationships described in paragraphs (1), (4), or (6) of subsection 203(a), or any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence claiming that an alien is entitled to a preference status by reason of the relationship described in section 203(a)(3), or any person, institution, firm, organization, or governmental agency desiring to have an alien

classified as a preference immigrant under section 203(a)(2), or any United States citizen, or permanent resident alien desiring and intending to employ an alien within the United States, whom he believes is entitled to a preference immigrant status under section 203(a)(6), may file a petition with the Attorney General for such classification of the alien. The petition shall be in such form as the Attorney General may by regulations prescribe and shall contain such information and be supported by such documentary evidence as the Attorney General may require. The petition shall be made under oath administered by any individual having authority to administer oaths, if executed in the United States, but, if executed outside the United States, administered by a consular officer.

"(b) After an investigation of the facts in each case, and after consultation with the Secretary of Labor in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor and the Attorney General with respect to petitions to accord a status under sections 203(a)(2) or 203(a)(6), the Attorney General shall, if he determines that the facts stated in the petition are true and that the alien in behalf of whom the petition is made is eligible for a preference status under section 203(a), approve the petition and forward one copy thereof to the Department of State. The Secretary of State shall then authorize the consular officer concerned to grant the preference status.

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b) no more than two petitions may be approved for one petitioner in behalf of a child as defined in section 101(b)(1)(E) or (F) unless necessary to prevent the separation of brothers and sisters and no petition shall be approved if the alien has previously been accorded a nonquota or preference status as the spouse of a citizen of the United States or the spouse of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, by reason of a marriage determined by the Attorney General to have been entered into for the purpose of evading the immigration laws.

"(d) The Attorney General shall forward to the Congress a report on each approved petition for immigrant status under sections 203(a)(2) or 203(a)(6) stating the basis for his approval and such facts as were by him deemed to be pertinent in establishing the beneficiary's qualifications for the preferential status. Such reports shall be submitted to the Congress on the first and fifteenth day of each calendar month in which the Congress is in session.

"(e) Nothing in this section shall be construed to entitle an immigrant in behalf of whom a petition under this section is approved, to enter the United States as a preference immigrant under section 203(a) if upon his arrival at a port of entry in the United States he is found not to be entitled to such classification.

"Sec. 205. The Attorney General may, at any time, for what he deems to be good and sufficient cause, revoke the approval of any petition approved by him under section 204. Such revocation shall be effective as of the date of approval of any such petition. In no case, however, shall such revocation have effect unless there is mailed to the petitioner's last known address a notice of the revocation and unless notice of the revocation is communicated through the Secretary of State to the beneficiary of the petition before such beneficiary commences his journey to the United States. If notice of revocation is not so given, and the beneficiary applies for admission to the United States, his admissibility shall be determined in the manner provided for by sections 235 and 236.

"Sec. 206. If an immigrant having an immigrant visa is excluded from admission or

does not apply for admission to the United States, the validity of the immigrant visa, or if an alien having an immigrant visa issued to him as a preference immigrant is found not to be a preference immigrant, an immigrant visa may be issued in lieu thereof to any other immigrant."

SEC. 2. Section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 166; 8 U.S.C. 1101) is amended as follows:

(a) Paragraph (27) of subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(27) The term 'special immigrant' means—

(A) an immigrant who was born in any independent foreign country of the Western Hemisphere or in the Canal Zone, and the spouse and children of any such immigrant, if accompanying or following to join him;

"(B) an immigrant lawfully admitted for permanent residence, who is returning from a temporary visit abroad."

(b) Paragraph (32) of subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(32) The term 'profession' shall include but not be limited to architects, engineers, lawyers, ordained ministers of religion, physicians, surgeons, and teachers in elementary or secondary schools, colleges, academies, or seminaries."

(c) Subparagraph (1)(F) of subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(F) a child, under the age of fourteen at the time a petition is filed in his behalf to accord a preference classification under section 203(a)(1), who is an orphan because of the death or disappearance of, abandonment or desertion by, or separation or loss from, both parents, or for whom the sole or surviving parent is incapable of providing the proper care which will be provided the child if admitted to the United States and who has in writing irrevocably released the child for emigration and adoption; who has been adopted abroad by a United States citizen and his spouse who personally saw and observed the child prior to or during the adoption proceedings; or who is coming to the United States for adoption by a United States citizen and spouse who have complied with the preadoption requirements, if any, of the child's proposed residence; provided that no natural parent or prior adoptive parent of any such child shall thereafter, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under this Act."

(d) Paragraph (6) of subsection (b) is repealed.

SEC. 3. Section 211 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 181; 8 U.S.C. 1181) is amended to read as follows:

"Section 211. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) no immigrant shall be admitted into the United States unless at the time of application for admission he (1) has a valid unexpired immigrant visa or was born subsequent to the issuance of such visa of the accompanying parent and (2) presents a valid unexpired passport or other suitable travel document, or document of identity and nationality, if such document is required under the regulations issued by the Attorney General.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212(a)(20) of this Act in such cases or in such classes of cases and under such conditions as may be by regulations prescribed, returning resident immigrants, defined in section 101(a)(27)(B), who are otherwise admissible may be readmitted to the United States by the Attorney General in his discretion without being required to obtain a passport, immigrant visa, reentry permit, or other documentation."

SEC. 4. Subsection 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 182; 8 U.S.C. 1182) is amended as follows:

(a) (1) is amended to read as follows:

(1) aliens who are mentally retarded;"

(b) Paragraph (1) is amended to read as follows:

(4) aliens afflicted with a mental defect, with sexual deviation, or with psychopathic personality."

(c) The last sentence of paragraph (14) is amended to read as follows: "The exclusion of aliens under this paragraph shall apply only to special immigrants defined in section 101(a)(27)(A) (other than the parents, spouses or children of the United States citizens or of aliens lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence), and to non-preference immigrant aliens described in section 203(a)(8)."

(d) Paragraph (20) is amended by deleting the final (c) and substituting therefor the letter (a).

(e) Paragraph (21) is amended by deleting the word "quota."

(f) Paragraph (24) is amended by deleting the language within the parentheses and substituting therefor the following: "other than aliens described in section 101(a)(27)."

Sec. 5. The Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175; 8 U.S.C. 1151) is amended as follows:

(a) Section 221(a) is amended by deleting the words "the quota, if any, to which the immigrant is charged, the immigrants particular status under such quota, the particular nonquota category in which the immigrant is classified, if a nonquota immigrant," and substituting in lieu thereof the words "the preference, nonpreference, or special immigration classification to which the alien is charged."

(b) The fourth sentence of subsection 212(c) is amended by deleting the word "quota" preceding the word "number;" the word "quota" preceding the word "year;" and the word "quota" preceding the word "immigrant," and substituting in lieu thereof the word "an."

(c) Section 224 is amended to read as follows: "A consular officer may, subject to the limitations provided in section 221, issue an immigrant visa to a special immigrant as such upon satisfactory proof, under regulations prescribed under the Act, that the applicant is entitled to a special immigrant status."

(d) Subsection 243(h) is amended by deleting the word "physical."

Sec. 6. Section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 214; 8 U.S.C. 1254) is amended as follows:

(a) Subsection (d) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Upon the cancellation of deportation in the case of any alien under this section, the Attorney General shall record the alien's lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date of cancellation of deportation of such alien is made, and unless the alien is entitled to a special immigrant classification under section 101(a)(27)(A), the Secretary of State shall reduce by one the number of nonpreference immigrant visas authorized to be issued under section 203(a)(8) for the fiscal year then current."

(b) Subsection (f) is repealed.

Sec. 7. Section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 217; 8 U.S.C. 1255) is amended as follows:

(a) Subsection (a) is amended by deleting the words "other than an alien crewman."

(b) Subsection (b) is amended to read:

"(b) Upon the approval of an application for adjustment made under subsection (a), the Attorney General shall record the alien's lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date the order of the Attorney General approving the application for the adjustment of status is made, and the Secretary of State shall reduce by one the number of the preference or nonpreference visas authorized to be issued under section 203(a) within the class to which the alien is chargeable, for the fiscal year then current."

(c) Subsection (c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The provisions of this section shall not be applicable to any alien who is of the class described in section 101(a)(27)(A)."

Sec. 8. Section 249 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 219; 8 U.S.C. 1259) is amended by changing the words "June 28, 1940," to read "December 24, 1952," and by adding at the end thereof the following: "Upon approval of the creation of a record of lawful admission for permanent residence, unless the alien is entitled to a special immigrant classification under section 101(a)(27)(A), the Secretary of State shall reduce by one the number of nonpreference immigrant visas authorized to be issued under section 203(a)(8) for the fiscal year then current."

Sec. 9. Section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 230; 8 U.S.C. 1351) is amended as follows:

(a) Paragraph (2) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) For the issuance of each immigrant visa, \$20; except that such fee shall be \$10 in the case of any alien who is the beneficiary of a petition required under section 204, provided that by regulation the Secretary of State may prescribe the partial deposit or prepayment of such fee at the time of registration."

(b) Paragraph (6) is amended to read as follows:

"(6) For filing with the Attorney General of each petition under section 204, \$10; and"

Sec. 10. Sections 1, 2, and 11 of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 505-505); as amended by section 6 of the Act of June 28, 1962 (76 Stat. 124), is repealed.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1 of the bill rewrites completely title II, chapter I (secs. 201-206) of the Immigration and Nationality Act and substitutes a selective immigration system for the present national origins quota system.

Section 201 fixes the total number of aliens from the former quota countries and areas who may acquire permanent residence immigration status in any fiscal year at 225,000—a slight increase over annual total immigration per year during the last decade. To provide for orderly administrative procedures, not more than 60,000 visas may be issued in each of the first three quarters of any fiscal year.

Section 202 expresses in statutory language a national policy that within the ceiling fixed by section 201, no preference or priority will be given to any person in acquiring permanent residence in the United States because of his or her race, sex, nationality, place of birth, or place of foreign residence.

This section also sets a maximum ceiling of 20,000 on the number of nationals of any one country who may obtain permanent residence annually, exempting from that ceiling only the husbands, wives, children, fathers, and mothers of U.S. citizens.

Section 203(a) lists the order of preference which is to be given in the allocation of the annual 225,000 immigrant visas.

First preference is given, without any limit on the numbers, to spouses, children, and parents of U.S. citizens.

The numbers which will remain after the first preference is satisfied will be available to the following six classes, in the percentages indicated:

Second preference, 10 percent to members of the professions and scientists and persons with skill and talent in the visual and performing arts.

Third preference, 20 percent to spouses, children, and parents of aliens who have previously been admitted for permanent residence but who have not yet become citizens.

Fourth preference, 20 percent to married sons and daughters of U.S. citizens.

Fifth preference, 20 percent to brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens.

Sixth preference, 20 percent to persons with skills which are found by the Secretary of Labor to be unavailable or in short supply in this country.

Seventh preference, 10 percent to refugees from Communist tyranny and oppression with a proviso that up to one-half of this number may be used by persons who have been offered a temporary refuge in this country upon a finding that they are unable or unwilling to return to their homelands because of persecution or fear thereof, and only after 2 years residence in this country.

Only after the above preferences have been satisfied will visa numbers which remain to be made available on a first-come, first-served order of registration to nonpreference applicants on a worldwide basis.

Within this nonpreference class there is created a reserve, under the control of the President, by which he may reallocate up to one-half the available numbers to nationals of countries who may be adversely affected by the immediate termination of the national origins quota system. For example, in Germany and the United Kingdom where the largest quota allocations are available, there has been no occasion or opportunity for desiring immigrants to register on a consular waiting list as was necessary for thousands of nationals of countries with heavily oversubscribed quotas. Consequently, in a worldwide competition for nonpreference numbers, such nationals may be unfairly disadvantaged particularly in the years immediately following the passage of the bill.

The President's reserve would also be available to increase the number of refugees who could be admitted should a sudden, abnormal refugee situation occur, such as arose in Austria after the 1956 unsuccessful revolt of the Hungarian freedom fighters, or to take care of disaster situations such as occurred in the Azores in 1957 which necessitated special legislation to authorize admission of a number of its victims.

Section 203(b) amends the present act to provide that the priority date for all preference immigrants shall be the date on which a petition to accord such a preference has been filed with the Attorney General.

Sections 203(c) and (d) substantially reiterate provisions contained in the present act on the priority of consideration of visa applicants and the prohibition against a consul issuing a preference visa unless and until a petition has been approved. Technical changes in language caused by the elimination of the quota system are also made.

Section 204 rewrites the present sections 204 and 205 to combine a single procedure for the filing of visa petitions with the Attorney General to accord the seven preference classifications described in section 203.

This section also continues a limitation on the number of orphans who may be adopted by a single family to two. It also prohibits the approval of a petition for an alien who has been found to have married a citizen or permanent resident alien for the purpose of gaining a preference under the immigration laws.

Section 205 repeats the present section 206 of the act providing for the revocation of visa petition approvals for fraud, illegality, or change of status.

Section 206 changes present section 207 of the act to permit the reissue to another applicant under the same number, a visa not used by the initial holder of the visa.

Section 2 of the bill amends three definitions contained in the present act:

It repeals the present nonquota provisions of the act, but continues to classify as immigrants, and continues to exempt from the numerical ceiling, aliens already admitted as immigrants who are returning to the United

June 1, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

States after a temporary absence abroad, and aliens who are natives of independent countries of the Western Hemisphere.

It repeals the definition and concept of a quota immigrant and defines the professional classes of preference immigrants to include doctors, lawyers, teachers, professors, clergymen, and engineers.

It defines in one place an "eligible orphan," the confusing definition of which exists currently in three separate sections of the law.

Section 3 of the bill essentially repeats the language of the present act which requires a visa and a passport for every arriving immigrant. It broadens the authority of the Attorney General to waive these documents for returning residents.

Section 4 of the bill makes technical changes in the language of the excluding provisions contained in section 212 of the act. The material changes are:

The words "mentally retarded" are substituted for the language "feeble-minded." "Epilepsy" is deleted as a mandatory exclusion ground.

Both of the above changes were based on the testimony of the Surgeon General's office.

Other changes are required to delete language which would become obsolete with the elimination of the quota system.

Section 5 of the bill removes the word "physical" from the language of section 243(h) of the act which permits the Attorney General to stay the deportation of an alien whom he believes would be subjected to (physical) persecution on his return to his homeland. This provision recognizes that the more subtle, mental, moral, and emotional sanctions imposed on their captive citizens by these totalitarian regimes are no less a basis for our refusal to return these people to their native lands and to such oppression. This sanction also makes other conforming changes.

Section 6 of the bill amends section 244 of the act, the suspension of deportation procedures, to make eligible for that privilege citizens of Western Hemisphere countries and aliens who entered the United States as crewmen, presently ineligible under the terms of the current act.

Section 7 of the bill amends section 245 of the act, the adjustment of status procedure, to make eligible for adjustment to permanent residence within this country, any alien in the United States (other than a native of the Western Hemisphere) who, if abroad, would be eligible for the immediate issuance of a visa. It removes the current ineligibility of crewmen for the privilege.

Section 8 of the bill amends section 249, the "registry" provisions, by advancing the date of entry of eligibles from June 28, 1940, to December 24, 1952. Under the amendment, any alien who entered the United States prior to the latter date and has resided here since, and is of good character, may be granted the status of a permanent resident. The section is, in effect, a limited statute of limitation against deportation.

All cases which result in the grant of permanent residence status by application within the United States under sections 244, 245, and 249 will also result in the deduction of 1 number in the overall ceiling of 225,000 immigrants a year.

Section 9 of the bill prescribes a uniform cost for immigrant visa issuance of \$20, and authorizes the partial deposit or prepayment of such fee at the time of registration.

Section 10 of the bill repeals the Fair Share Refugee Act (secs. 1, 2, and 11 of the act of July 14, 1960), rendered unnecessary by the provisions for visa issuance to refugees under the preference classification of section 203(a)(7) of the bill.

The repeal of this provision should result in the use of the more appropriate visa-issuing procedure as the method of docu-

menting the entry of immigrants into the country and to limit the use of the parole provisions of the act (sec. 212(d)(5)) to the purposes originally intended—the temporary reception of persons arriving in the United States without documentation and under emergent circumstances, e.g., shipwrecked crewmen, and so forth.

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

EXPANDED PROGRAMS OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 198)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The American people want their Government to be not only strong but compassionate. They know that a society is secure only where social justice is secure for all its citizens. When there is turmoil anywhere in our own country, our instinct is to inquire if there is injustice. That instinct is sound. And these principles of compassion and justice do not stop at the water's edge. We do not have one policy for our own people and another for our friends abroad.

A vast revolution is sweeping the southern half of this globe. We do not intend that the Communists shall become the beneficiaries of this revolt against injustice and privation. We intend to lead vigorously in that struggle. We will continue to back that intention with practical and concrete help.

In southeast Asia today, we are offering our hand and our abundance to those who seek to build a brighter future. The effort to create more progressive societies cannot wait for an ideal moment. It cannot wait until peace has been finally secured. We must move ahead now.

I know of no more urgent task ahead. It requires more of us, more of other prosperous nations, and more of the people of southeast Asia.

For our part, I propose that we expand our own economic assistance to the people of South Vietnam, Thailand, and Laos.

I propose we start now to make available our share of the money needed to harness the resources of the entire southeast Asia region for the benefit of all its people. This must be an international venture. That is why I have asked Mr. Eugene Black to consult with the United Nations Secretary General and the leaders of the poor and advanced nations. Our role will be vital, but we hope that all other industrialized nations, including the Soviet Union, will participate.

To support our own effort, I ask the Congress to authorize and appropriate for fiscal year 1966 an additional \$89 million for the Agency for International Development for expanded programs of

development in southeast Asia.

This money will serve many purposes:

First, Approximately \$19 million will provide the first installment of our contribution to the accelerated development of the Mekong River Basin. This is an important part of the general program of regional development which I outlined at Johns Hopkins University on April 7. This money will enable us to meet a request for half the cost of building the Nam Ngum Dam, which the international Mekong Committee has marked "top priority" if the Mekong River is to be put to work for the people of the region. This will be the first Mekong power project to serve two countries, promising power to small industry and lights for thousands of homes in northeast Thailand and Laos. The funds will provide also for:

Powerlines across the Mekong linking Laos and Thailand.

Extensive studies of further hydroelectric, irrigation, and flood control projects on the Mekong main stream and its tributaries;

Expansion of distribution lines in Laos.

Second, Five million dollars will be used to support electrification cooperatives near three provincial towns—Long Xuyen, Dalat, and Nha Thang—in South Vietnam. Co-ops, which have been so important to the lives of our rural people, will bring the benefits of low priced electricity to more than 200,000 Vietnamese. We hope this pattern can be duplicated in towns and villages throughout the region. I will ask that we provide further support if the pattern meets the success we believe possible.

Third, Seven million dollars will help provide improved medical and surgical services, especially in the more remote areas of Vietnam, Laos and Thailand. South Vietnam is tragically short of doctors; some 200 civilian physicians must care for a population of 15 million.

In Laos the system of AID-supported village clinics and rural hospitals now reaches more than a million people. But that is not enough. We propose to extend the program in Laos, assist the Thailand Government to expand its public health services to thousands of rural villages, and to organize additional medical and surgical teams for sick and injured civilians in South Vietnam.

Better health is the first fruit of modern science. For the people of these countries it has far too long been an empty promise. I hope that when peace comes our medical assistance can be expanded and made available to the sick and wounded of the area without regard to political commitment.

Fourth, Approximately \$6 million will be used to train people for the construction of roads, dams, and other small-scale village projects in Thailand and Laos. In many parts of Asia the chance of the villager for markets, education, and access to public services depends on his getting a road. A nearby water well dramatically lightens the burdens of the farmer's wife. With these tools and skills local people can build their own

schools and approved for release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000100040001-6 that the problem of screening applicants in New York City has run into many conflicts and difficulties.

dreamed of before.

Fifth. Approximately \$45 million will be used to finance increasing imports of iron and steel, cement, chemicals and pesticides, drugs, trucks, and other essential goods necessary for a growing civilian economy. This money will allow factories not only to continue but, through investment, to expand production of both capital and consumer goods. It will provide materials for urgently needed low-cost housing. And it will maintain production incentives and avoid inflation. It is not easy for a small country, with a low income, to fight a war on its own soil and at the same time persist in the business of nation building. The additional import support which I propose will help Vietnam to persevere in this difficult task.

Sixth. An additional \$7 million will supplement the present program of agricultural development and support additional Government services in all three countries, and will help in the planning of further industrial expansion in the secure areas of Vietnam.

Much of the additional assistance I request is for Vietnam. This is not a poor and unfavored land. There is water and rich soil and ample natural resources. The people are patient, hard-working, the custodians of a proud and ancient civilization. They have been oppressed not by nature but by man. The failures of man can be redeemed. That is the purpose of the aid for which I now ask additional authorization.

We are defending the right of the people of South Vietnam to decide their own destiny. Where this right is attacked by force, we have no alternative but to reply with strength. But military action is not a final solution in this area; it is only a partial means to a much larger goal. Freedom and progress will be possible in Vietnam only as the people are assured that history is on their side—that it will give them a chance to make a living in peace, to educate their children, to escape the ravages of disease and, above all, to be free of the oppressors who for so long have fed on their labors.

Our effort on behalf of the people of southeast Asia should unite, not divide, the people of that region. Our policy is not to spread conflict but to heal conflict.

I ask the Congress, as part of our continuing affirmation of America's faith in the cause of man, to respond promptly and fully to this request.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 1, 1965.

THE FAILURE OF NEW YORK CITY TO IMPLEMENT THE JOB CORPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILIGAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate two young men from New York City who have become the unsung heroes of the antipoverty war.

Fifth Avenue—ticker tape and all. They certainly deserve to be remembered in the history of the antipoverty war.

The administration of the city of New York is the second largest in the Nation. It has proclaimed its own war on poverty.

Over the last year, the city administration has set up an antipoverty operations board, hired employees, moved and moved again into new and better offices. It has spent, or seen spent, several hundred thousand dollars in antipoverty work.

The city administration has insisted it understands the vastness of poverty in New York City. More than a million residents have incomes of less than \$1,600. Some 75,000 youths are out of school and out of work.

And presumably the city administration saw the importance of the Job Corps. Recruiting out of school and out of work youth, the corps would get youths off the streets, give them work, inspiration, and skills.

And so in March, the Office of Economic Opportunity asked New York City to recommend 830 youths for the Job Corps initial enrollment.

Plenty of youths wanted to get in the Job Corps. Although New York has had no substantive publicity for the Corps, some 1,597 youths have written to the Corps from New York City. Across the Nation, some 300,000 have written in. They are applying at the rate of 15,000 every week.

Presumably, on the call of the Office of Economic Opportunity, New York's antipoverty organization shifted into high gear.

Each youth had to be interviewed. A form had to be made out, a physical taken. Eight hundred and thirty had to be selected from some 1,600 known volunteers, from some 75,000 out-of-school and out-of-work youngsters.

Presumably, the New York antipoverty organization would send forms to Washington. Waiting computers would correlate each applicant's needs with various Corps center programs, and would assign him to the appropriate center.

Presumably, this activity went on for more than 2 months. And then someone asked what had been done? Were all the youths in camps using up the quota for New York? Could not the city, with summer here, get the Office of Economic Opportunity to allocate more places for its thousands of needy youths?

But in more than 2 months—by the end of May—the New York City antipoverty organization had gotten not 830, not 300, not 200, not 100, not even 10 youths in a Job Corps camp.

The organization had gotten just two—exactly two—New York youths in Job Corps camps.

But am I being sarcastic, unfair?

True, only two got into camps. But the New York organization actually did screen 26 applicants, and sent the forms to Washington.

Yet the figures deceive. For of the 26, this efficient New York City administration filled out 7 of the simple forms incorrectly. They had to be returned.

One of these conflicts is centered on the question of who is going to give the required medical examination. The Government pays a fee for each examination.

I realize this is not really funny.

It is not even sad.

It is inexcusable—especially in a city where a million people suffer destitution, where 500,000 are on welfare, where narcotics has cut the hope from countless lives, where poverty breeds poverty and thousands of youngsters find no way out; where frustrations and desperations abound.

The Job Corps was created by Congress to reach young people between the ages of 16 and 21 who are largely unemployable because they lack education and skills. It is aimed at young people who have not completed high school and who have not found work. At the conservation camps and training centers, basic education and job training are being provided for some 2,500 youths, and by June 30, 10,000 will be enrolled.

This program is being ignored by a city government which should be painfully aware of the social dynamite.

Two weeks ago the Office of Economic Opportunity had to ask the New York State Employment Service to step into New York City and screen 200 applicants.

New York City lags behind every major city in the country. Until the New York Times reported on the situation on May 15, not a single New York City youth was actually at a Job Corps center.

Mr. Speaker, since the city antipoverty operations board is apparently incapable of doing the screening, I call upon Sargent Shriver, the Director, and the Office of Economic Opportunity to set up special emergency screening centers in New York City to process applications immediately.

Congress provided this resource almost a year ago—and we must put it to use—now, before another troubled summer—to help deprived youth break the chains of poverty.

A BILL TO BRING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUILDING AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF THE FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. SWEENEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 to bring under the supervision of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board those building and loan associations and similar institutions in the District of Columbia which are not now subject to such regulation.

At the present time, the District of Columbia statutes neither regulate these institutions directly nor do they confer